

ENGLISH STUDIES

A JOURNAL OF ENGLISH
LETTERS AND PHILOLOGY

Edited

in collaboration with EILERT EKWALL,
Lund, and H. LÜDEKE, Basel,

by

R. W. ZANDVOORT

GRONINGEN

1940

VOLUME TWENTY-TWO

===== NOS 1-6 =====

CONTENTS

ARTICLES

		Page
BONNARD, G.,	The Invasion of Switzerland and English Public Opinion (January to April 1798)	1
DRAPER, J. W.,	Signior Brabantio, Plaintiff	193
KIRCHNER, G.,	<i>To Want</i> as an Auxiliary of Modality	129
MILLER, D. C.,	Iago and the Problem of Time	97
MULDER, H.,	Demonstrative Pronouns	171
NOSWORTHY, J. M.,	A Reading of the Play-Scene in <i>Hamlet</i>	161
TOLLES, F. B.,	The Praetorian Cohorts	49

REVIEWS

Ainsworth, E. G.,	Poor Collins (H. LÜDEKE)	39
Baratier, P.,	Lord Bolingbroke, <i>Ses Ecrits Politiques</i> (F. T. WOOD)	37
—————,	Letters Inédites de Bolingbroke à Lord Stair (F. T. WOOD)	37
Bense, J. F.,	A Dictionary of the Low-Dutch Element in the English Vocabulary (C. B. VAN HAERINGEN)	141
Blancquaert, E., & Pée, W. (edd.),	Proceedings of the Third International Congress of Phonetic Sciences (M. SCHUBIGER)	217
Brie, F.,	Die nationale Literatur Schotlands von den Anfängen bis zur Renaissance (A. MACDONALD)	122
Brouwer, J. H.,	Jan Jansz. Starter (D. KALMA)	180

		Page
Casady, E.,	Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey (R. W. ZANDVOORT)	178
Clavel, M.,	Fenimore Cooper. Sa vie et son œuvre. La Jeunesse (1789-1826) (H. LÜDEKE)	205
—————,	Fenimore Cooper and his Critics. American, British and French Criticisms of the Novelist's Early Work (H. LÜDEKE)	205
Glunz, H. H.,	Der <i>Hamlet</i> Shakespeares (R. W. ZANDVOORT)	155
Green, F. C.,	Minuet: A Critical Survey of French and English Literary Ideas in the Eighteenth Century (K. R. GALLAS)	78
Hartman, H.W. (ed.),	<i>A Petite Pallace of Pettie his Pleasure</i> (R. W. ZANDVOORT)	148
Jespersen, O.,	En Sprogmands Levned (E. EKWALL)	30
—————,	Essentials of English Grammar (H. MULDER)	88
Marshall, L. B. (ed.),	Rare Poems of the Seventeenth Century (J. M. NOSWORTHY)	35
Mersand, J.,	Chaucer's Romance Vocabulary (E. DEUSCHLE)	119
Nelson, W.,	John Skelton, Laureate (F. BRIE)	123
Pearsall Smith, L.,	Unforgotten Years (D. G. VAN DER VAT)	41
Spencer, H.,	The Art and Life of William Shakespeare (A. G. VAN KRANENDONK)	150
Sundermann, K. H.,	Hermann Melvilles Gedankengut (G. KIRCHNER)	210
Taylor, W.,	Doughty's English (M. H. BRAAKSMA)	214
Templeman, W. D.,	The Life and Work of William Gilpin (F. T. WOOD)	203
Tucker Brooke (ed.),	Shakespeare's Sonnets (H. LÜDEKE)	151
Weber, W.,	Hermann Melville, Eine Stilistische Unter- suchung (G. KIRCHNER)	210
Weekley, E.,	Jack and Jill. A Study in Our Christian Names (J. F. BENSE)	32

MISCELLANEOUS

Page

Current Literature: 1939 (F. T. WOOD)

I. Fiction, Drama and Poetry

181

Notes and News

Ekwall, E., Andreas Heusler †, 77. — Fink, Z. S., Milton's Retirement to Horton and Renaissance Literary Theory, 137. — King, A. H., Some Notes on Shakespeare's *Tempest*, 70. — Kirchner, G., (*To be*) *Due* as a (Passive) Verb-Equivalent, 27. — Miller, D. C., Titania and the Changeling, 66. — Whitbread, L., Grendel's Abode: An Illustrative Note, 64. — Zandvoort, R. W., 'Pregnant' one, 199.

War Words, 29, 75, 116, 138, 177, 201.

Oxford Dictionary of Modern English, 30. — J. A. Falconer †, 30. — R. B. McKerrow †, 30. — Dr. B. A. P. van Dam †, 118. — Jespersen's *Modern English Grammar*, 202.

Brief Mention

43, 156, 220

Bibliography

45, 126, 158, 221

The Invasion of Switzerland and English Public Opinion (January to April 1798)

The Background to S. T. Coleridge's *France: An Ode*

The conviction with which Coleridge had championed the Revolution ever since, hardly more than a boy, he had sung the Fall of the Bastille, was first shaken towards the end of April 1796. England had offered peace to France on condition that Holland should recover her liberty and France had refused. Coleridge was obliged to confess — in *The Watchman* — that the Republic was intent on conquering rather than emancipating other nations, and he adjured France not to renew the horrors of war. War, however, was renewed, and not through England's fault. For a moment it looked as though Coleridge would enlist in the war-party. But this mood was transient. It helped to kill *The Watchman* which had been supported by Radicals only, and almost starved the poet who soon had reason to repent his temporary desertion from his political principles, when reports came from France explaining that the peace-conditions offered by England to her enemy were quite different from what he had been led to believe. Pitt had told the country that war must be renewed because France insisted on keeping Holland, and he, Coleridge, had been taken in, for now the French explained that the terms of peace were that the Republic should restore all her conquests, while England should keep all hers. If this account of the April negotiations was right, and the poet had no doubt that it was, then no one but Pitt was responsible for war being continued. His hatred of the prime minister came back with double force, and he gave vent to it in his curious poem *Fire, Famine, and Slaughter*. With this renewed hatred of Pitt there arose in him again hope of the success of the French Revolution. The *Ode to the Departing Year*, published on the last day of 1796, is all inspired by the passionate conviction that the French, despite all appearances, were really and truly fighting on the side of Liberty, and that, by opposing the Revolution, England was working her own destruction.

How far this position was maintained in the early months of 1797, we cannot say for certain. Perhaps his belief in the Revolution was already on the wane before Coleridge met Wordsworth. At any rate, one of the first effects of his new friendship was his assuming a more critical attitude towards both the Revolution itself and his own championship of it. This of course was only to be expected. Wordsworth had been a revolutionist himself, and had ceased being one after deep meditation, a searching criticism of revolutionary theories and of the philosophical positions they entailed. The Revolution was, we may suppose, eagerly discussed between them throughout the summer and autumn of 1797, all the more eagerly in fact since other men could join in the discussion, Poole and Thelwall in particular. Coleridge was all the more likely to be influenced by his friend's views since his revolutionary ardor had already suffered an eclipse in the

previous year, and since he looked on Wordsworth as a much bigger man than himself: "I speak with heartfelt sincerity," he wrote to Cottle in June, "and (I think) unblinded judgment, when I tell you that I feel myself a little man by his side, and yet do not think myself the less man than I formerly thought myself." This influence possibly accounts for the fact that in the second edition of his *Poems on Various Subjects*, Coleridge suppressed all his political sonnets. He had grown ashamed of their exaggerations. It also largely explains why, in the latter part of the winter he passed with Wordsworth at Nether Stowey and Alfoxden, he firmly and finally recanted his early admiration for the Revolution, his belief in a France destined to work out the salvation of mankind. He did not give up his passion for liberty, nor his conviction that through liberty, political liberty specially, mankind might attain peace and happiness. It was not his ideal that he gave up, but merely his trust in France and the Revolution as agents of its realisation. And if, besides Wordsworth's influence, there was one outside event which compelled him to give up his long-cherished delusion, it was the French conquest of Switzerland in the early months of 1798. Far from serving the cause of liberty, revolutionary France had betrayed it. Whereas she had promised to free all the nations of the world by the abolition of despotism and foreign rule, she had merely succeeded in strengthening despotism both at home in England and abroad, and was now placing free peoples under her own rule. She had promised peace to the world and given it war. It was from that continued faith in some of the ideals of the Revolution mixed up with a detestation of what the Revolution had come to be, that there sprang the mood in which he composed the three chief poems he wrote from February to July 1798, *France: an Ode*, *Fears in Solitude*, and *Recantation*.

The invasion of Switzerland was the direct occasion, if not of the inception¹ of *France: an Ode*, at least of its completion, and of its publication in *The Morning Post* of April 16, where it was prefaced by an editorial note which is well known to readers of Coleridge, as it may be found in E. H. Coleridge's editions of his grandfather's *Poems*, and elsewhere :

The following excellent Ode (so it runs) will be in unison with the feelings of every friend to Liberty and foe to Oppression: of all who, admiring the French Revolution, detest and deplore the conduct of France towards Switzerland. It is very satisfactory to find so zealous and steady an advocate for Freedom as Mr. COLERIDGE concur with us in condemning the conduct of France towards the Swiss Cantons. Indeed his concurrence is not singular; we know of no Friend to Liberty who is not of his opinion. What we most admire is the avowal of his sentiments, and public censure of the unprincipled and atrocious conduct of France

¹ *France: an Ode* was dated by Coleridge himself February 1798. This date has been accepted by all the biographers of the poet, the latest included (cf. E. K. Chambers, *Samuel Taylor Coleridge. A Biographical Study*. Oxford 1938, p. 91; L. Hanson, *The Life of S. T. Coleridge. The Early Years*. London [1938] p. 245). But the Ode cannot possibly have been completed before the very end of March, when the news of the Swiss defeat first reached England, as is made clear in the present study.

It is natural that this prefatory note should set a Swiss student of Coleridge wondering what was the extent, the depth and the sincerity of the indignation referred to by the editor of *The Morning Post*. Our curiosity led us first to the historians, but they proved most disappointing. They all refer to the indignation excited in England by the French invasion of Switzerland in vague, general, and often misleading, terms. To quote one of the most recent: *The Cambridge Modern History*² is content to say that

the impression caused by these events was widespread and profound. The revulsion of feeling in the minds of the formerly Gallophil poets, Wordsworth and Coleridge, found expression in lofty strains of indignation that expressed the general verdict of civilized Europe.

Legouis, however, in his *Youth of Wordsworth*³ had quoted, in support of a general statement of the same kind, a contemporary, or almost contemporary, document, namely a passage from Sir James Mackintosh's famous speech of the 21st of February 1803 in defence of John Peltier, the author of a libel against Napoleon. Peltier was being prosecuted because he had attacked the Emperor at a time when England happened to be at peace with France, and Mackintosh, after reminding his hearers of the invasion of Switzerland, "that unparalleled scene of guilt and enormity, that unprovoked aggression against an innocent country", in eloquent terms, turning towards the Counsel for the Crown, clinched his argument with these words:

I will ask my learned friend, if we had then been at peace with the French Republic, whether we must have been silent spectators of the foulest crimes that ever blotted the name of humanity; whether we must, like cowards and slaves, have repressed the compassion and indignation with which that horrible scene of tyranny had filled our hearts?

Though dating from five years after the events, and in the mouth of an advocate using it as an argument in the cause he was pleading, that at least was a document, something more valuable than the vague and too often declamatory assertions of the historians, especially as Mackintosh had been, in 1798, in a good position to know what was the state of public opinion. How had Legouis come across it? Had he instituted a regular search through contemporary documents and come back from it with only that little bit of information? Had all that wave of "compassion and indignation" left no trace of its existence beyond Coleridge's Ode, the prefatory note of *The Morning Post*, and such later witnesses of it as Bowles's *Sorrows of Switzerland* of 1801, Mackintosh's speech of 1803 and Wordsworth's Sonnet of 1807?⁴ Legouis, however, had probably never read Mackintosh's speech itself, his quotation from it being identical with

² vol. viii, p. 641.

³ ed. 1921, p. 375.

⁴ Those are the proofs most generally adduced of the impression made on Englishmen by the French conquest of Switzerland in 1798. G. Schirmer, *Die Schweiz im Spiegel englischer und amerikanischer Literatur bis 1848*, Zürich 1929, pp. 206-369, *passim*, mentions

that to be found in a note on page 474 of the fourth volume of Archibald Alison's forgotten *History of Europe from the Commencement of the French Revolution to... 1815*, published in 1849. And it looked as if no one had ever taken the trouble to find out what had been the extent, the depth and the sincerity of the indignation which Coleridge, according to the editor of *The Morning Post*, was sharing with all the friends of liberty in England. We therefore thought it worth while to make a systematic study of the contemporary press, from the daily papers to the monthly reviews, in order to ascertain what the reaction of English public opinion towards the invasion of Switzerland had really been. And the object of the present paper is to sum up the results of our search.

*

To begin with, it may be advisable to remind our readers of a few facts which had better be kept in mind if the attitude of the English press towards Swiss affairs in 1798 is to be properly understood. From the beginning of the French Revolution, public opinion in England had been divided between opponents and sympathisers. At the outset, many were the sympathisers, even among the Tories. But the early excesses of July 1789, and still more of October, had reduced their numbers considerably. When Burke published his *Reflections* in October 1790, he was preaching to a world which had already become converted to a policy of opposition to the Revolution. But there remained a good many enthusiasts, and the Revolution still had warm admirers and supporters among the Whigs,

a few more. But his list, which does not pretend to be exhaustive, might easily be added to. How deep and lasting that impression was is shown not only by the press surveyed in the present paper, but by

1°. the number of pamphlets bearing on the conquest which were translated into English and the manner of their reception:

A Prospect of the Political Relations which subsist between the French Republic and the Helvetic body. By Colonel Weiss translated by W. Butler (rev. in *The Gentleman's Magazine*, April 1798, p. 326; its final chapter quoted in full in same, May 1798, pp. 416-8).

A Rapid View of the Overthrow of Switzerland. By an Eye-witness. Translated from the French. — This was a translation of Carnot's *Coup d'oeil sur le renversement de la Suisse* published at the end of April 1798, and already rev. in *The Monthly Review*, vol. xxvi, (May-August 1798), pp. 546-8, and in *The British Critic*, August 1798, vol. xii, pp. 210-2, where the reviewer ends on these words: "we cannot but recommend it to be published in an English translation." — The translation followed at once, for it was rev. in September by *The Analytical Review*, vol. xxvii, pp. 316-9, *The Monthly Epitome*, vol. ii, p. 358, *The British Critic*, vol. xii, pp. 314-5, in November by *The Critical Review*, in July 1799 by *The Gentleman's Magazine*, vol. 1799, p. 602.

*A Short Account of the Invasion of Switzerland by the French, In a Letter from M. Mallet du Pan to M. de M.**** Translated from the French (rev. in *The Gentleman's Magazine*, August 1798, vol. 1798, p. 697).

Remonstrances addressed to the Executive Directory of the French Republic against the Invasion of Switzerland. By John Caspar Lavater (rev. in *The European Magazine and London Review*, September 1798, vol. xxxiv, pp. 190-1, *The British Critic*, September 1798, vol. xii, pp. 315-6, *The Monthly Review*, November 1798, vol. xxvii, pp. 351-2, *The Critical Review*, November 1798).

which led at last (1794) to a breach within the party of reform, Burke and his followers passing over to the Tories, while Fox continued at the head of a much diminished party. From 1790 to 1793 the growth of the anti-French spirit was constant, fostered as it was by the fall of the monarchy, the September massacres, and at last the execution of the King, as well as by the journalists at the devotion of the government, Pitt wanting to be compelled by public opinion to declare war on France so as to take advantage of her internal difficulties to promote the interests of his own country. War was actually declared in February 1793, and supported at first by the fanatic enthusiasm of the great majority of the nation. Fox and his friends lost all influence over a war-mad Parliament. Partisans of the Revolution were mobbed, hunted out of England, thrown into prison. This bellicose mood, however, was not of long duration. Inglorious campaigns, the growth of public expenditure, the rise of prices, soon put an end to it. People became war-sick, as they had been war-mad. Burke at one time was almost alone in advocating the prosecution of the war. And when Robespierre fell and still more when the Directory assumed the government of France, England clamoured for peace as, three years earlier, it had clamoured for war. Pitt long resisted that clamour. In 1796, however, negotiations were opened. They came to nothing. Neither France nor England would make the concessions which the other party demanded. The war was renewed. In spite of the failure of the French expedition against Ireland, of the victory over the Spanish fleet off Cape St. Vincent, the difficulties in which England was involved rapidly

The British Mercury, or, Historical and Critical views of The Events of the Present Times By J. Mallet Du Pan vol. I. No. I. II. III. containing *An Historical Essay upon the Destruction of the Helvetic League and Liberty* ... 1798. This was of course the English form of Mallet du Pan's *Mercure Britannique*, published in October 1798. It was reviewed in *The British Critic*, February 1799, vol. xiii, pp. 139-146, and in *The Gentleman's Magazine* for the same month, vol. 1799, pp. 143-5.

The History of the Invasion of Switzerland by the French and the Destruction of the Democratic Republics of Schwitz, Uri, and Unterwalden. By Henry Zschokke ... Translated from the French of J. B. Briatte ... 1803 (The translator, Dr. Aikin, contributes a preface which is another eloquent testimony to the commiseration felt for the Swiss in England). Rev. in *The Monthly Review*, Dec. 1803, vol. xlii, pp. 424-31. The same review had already spoken of Zschokke's *Histoire de la Destruction des Républiques Démocratiques* .., before it had been turned into English, cf. App. to vol. xxxviii, pp. 470-7.

2°. the few publications of Englishmen on the same subject:

Additions to Travels in Switzerland; containing an Historical Sketch and Notes on the late Revolution. By William Coxe ... 1802 (rev. in *The British Critic*, September 1802, vol. xx, pp. 306-7).

F. L. Clason, *The Case of Switzerland briefly stated by an Eye-witness* ... 1802 (rev. in *The British Critic*, March 1803, vol. xxii, p. 321).

A general View of the History of Switzerland; with a particular Account of the Origin and Accomplishment of the late Swiss Revolution. By John Wood ... 1799 (rev. in *The British Critic*, June 1799, vol. xiii, pp. 640-3 and *The Monthly Review*, November 1799, vol. xxx, pp. 287-91).

3°. the importance given to Swiss events in *The Annual Register for the Year 1798*, published in 1800, where they fill three chapters out of fifteen.

increased. The Bank ran short of gold. There were mutinies in the fleet. And the peace-party once more succeeded in compelling Pitt to open negotiations in the summer of 1797. Once again they broke down, early in September, and a war-weary England had to go on fighting. The situation was serious indeed. Ireland was becoming increasingly disaffected. Nothing had really been done to improve the very poor quality of the army. The mutinies in the fleet had been crushed, but they might break out again. All over the country, there were people clamouring for peace at any price. When Pitt explained that the Lille negotiations had come to nothing owing to the exorbitant conditions laid down by the Directory, he was generally disbelieved. The government, and the war-party behind it, realised that a tremendous effort had to be made in order to try and turn the temper of the nation. Fortunately for their propaganda, it had come to be rumoured that the Directory was planning the invasion of England. Much was made of those threats. And little by little, in those autumn months which Coleridge and Wordsworth were spending in distant Somerset, engaged in endless discussions, political and literary, and in laying out plans for the rescue of English poetry from the morass of pseudo-classicism, in those autumn months which saw the birth of *The Ancient Mariner*, the war-spirit was revived. Still, it made but slow progress at first, in spite of Campo-Formio and the acquiescence of Austria in the French conquests of the Netherlands and Northern Italy. The Netherlands had long been in French hands and the supremacy of England at sea had not yet been destroyed. Italy was rather far away, and the Italians had always been under the domination of some one or other. It did not much matter to Englishmen if the Austrians were driven from

4°. published sermons such as W. Vincent's *A Sermon, delivered in the Church of St. Magnus, London Bridge, November 25th* (extracts given in *The Gentleman's Magazine*, December 1799, pp. 1053-5) and, of much greater importance, Sydney Smith's sermon *For the Swiss* preached at Edinburgh also in November 1798, and published in the second volume of his *Sermons*, 1800.

5°. such very minor poetry as Leigh Hunt's *Ode For 1799 Written at the Time of the War in Switzerland*, to be found in his *Juvenilia*, and J. C. Hubbard's *Jacobinism. A Poem ... 1801*, some lines from the conclusion of which may be given here :

Helvetian vales ! where Freedom fix'd her sway,
 And all the social virtues loved to stray ;
 Soft blissful seats of undisturb'd repose,
 Revered, for ages, by contending foes,
 What envious demon, ranging to destroy,
 Has marr'd your sports, and closed your songs of joy ?
 What horrid yells the affrighted ear assail !
 What screams of terror load the passing gale !
 See ruffian hordes with tiger-rage advance,
 The shame of manhood, and the boast of France !
 See trampled, crush'd and torn, in lustful strife,
 The loathing virgin, and indignant wife !
 While wanton carnage sweeps each crowded wood,
 And all the mountain torrents swell with blood.

Lombardy by the armies of the Republic. It was hard therefore to rouse the British lion to a sense of the danger he was in.

But when Switzerland was threatened in her turn, when the little country which Englishmen had long been accustomed to regard as the home of liberty fell a victim to Revolutionary France, it became wonderfully easy for the war-party to persuade all Englishmen that their own independence was at stake and that the fate that had befallen Switzerland would be theirs before long if they did not do all in their power to avert it.

The French conquest of Switzerland thus came as a true godsend to Pitt, the government and the anti-French party in England. It helped them, as nothing else except the landing of a French army on the South coast could have done, to rally all the nation round their policy of resistance until complete victory was achieved. It is in the light of that all-important fact that the papers and periodicals of January to May 1798 must be read.

But to say that the war-party made capital out of the invasion of Switzerland is not, by any means, to assert that the indignation felt over it in England was not sincere. As a matter of fact, if it proved so useful to the partisans of war, it was just because the indignation which it excited was spontaneous indeed that the Whigs and even the Radicals were swept off their feet and began denouncing France before they perceived where this would lead them. This is not the place to explain why Englishmen were so deeply moved by the fate of Switzerland. It was not merely that the Swiss were a small people, that in the imagination of Englishmen they symbolized national independence, personal liberty, happiness and prosperity based upon simple habits; it was also due to the ties that had sprung up between our country and many Englishmen and to the interest long taken by the reading and travelling classes of England in Swiss concerns.

■

How did the news concerning events in Switzerland reach the English public from early in January 1798 to the 23rd of March, when it was at last informed of the overthrow of Bern? The newspapers had two chief sources of information. On the one hand, occasional correspondents, some English, others Swiss, sent them letters from where they stayed or lived. Most of those letters are dated from Basle, Geneva and Bern. But some arrived also from Zürich, Lausanne and a few other places. One of the most interesting and detailed accounts of the revolution in the Pays de Vaud is given in a letter from Orbe. There were writers, too, who dated their letters from the "Frontiers of Switzerland". The second chief source of information was the Paris gazettes, in which the Whig and radical papers were accustomed to put more or less implicit faith while the conservative papers looked upon them with great suspicion. The news of the Swiss defeats, for instance, first reached London through some French papers of the 9th, 10th and 11th of March which were smuggled into England a week later; the papers on the side of the government refused to believe in it and, with the exception of *The Times*, did not reproduce it; the opposition papers hoped the news was wrong, but presented it to their readers, though as being no more than a first rumour.

The Directory had decreed that all intercourse between France and England should stop, so that French papers arrived irregularly and were often lacking for days at a time. The mail suffered considerable delays, whether it came via France or via Germany, and letters from Switzerland were received any time between a fortnight and six weeks after they were posted.

Such being their sources of information and such the difficulties under which they laboured, it is easy to understand that, so far as news went, the papers were bound to offer their readers pretty much the same thing. What difference there was was due to the different use made of the Paris gazettes by editors on the side of the government and editors on the side of the opposition, and to the fact that the former printed either reluctantly or not at all the letters from correspondents whose revolutionary enthusiasm was undisguised, while the latter had a preference for just such letters. But, that being said, any of the leading papers, whether in favour of, or against, Pitt's policy, might be taken to show how the English public got to know what was happening in Switzerland. If we take *The True Briton* first, it is not because it was the organ of the most reactionary section of the Tories, but simply because it was particularly sparing in its comments and largely confined itself to keeping its readers informed of what was going on.

Throughout 1797, *The True Briton* had not once referred to Switzerland. On the 6th of January 1798, however, it began to devote some attention to Swiss affairs, mentioning in a brief paragraph the departure from Switzerland of Wickham, the English minister to the Swiss cantons; his withdrawal had been requested by Bern in compliance with the Directory's express desire. This event is briefly commented upon in the editorial of the 23rd of January which prints in full the English minister's letter to the Bernese government of the previous November. Wickham explains that his withdrawal is due to his Sovereign's "anxious solicitude for the preservation of (the) tranquillity" of the Swiss; his presence in Switzerland must not be made "to serve as a pretext to the hostile project of a Neighbour". This same issue of the 23rd of January contains a full column of Swiss news describing the spirit shown by the Swiss in preparing to resist the aggressions of the French, but stressing also their deplorable lack of union. This double aspect of the situation in our country is again insisted upon at the beginning of the editorial of the 25th. On the 29th, *The True Briton* prints a short letter from a correspondent in Bern who refers at some length to the apprehensions of the Bernese government. On the 30th, it gives in full their answer to Wickham. The editorial of the 1st of February again opens on the subject of Switzerland, this time with an objective summary of news ending with the statement that "the Swiss are rapidly advancing towards a revolution"; a column and a half of news from various sources follows. Letters dated from 'Aarau January 5.' and 'Strasburg January 9.', detailing the revolutionary demands of the Pays de Vaud, are given on the 6th of February. The Vevey insurrection of

the 5th of January (the storming of Chillon) is given a line on the 9th. On the 13th, our paper publishes the Directory's message of the 5th of February concerning the entrance of the French troops into Vaud and briefly refers to it in its editorial. On the following day the news column mentions the Thierrens affair, which is presented as having been a French contrivance as likely as a real skirmish :

... The French have *contrived the death* of two of their soldiers, or taken an advantage of an event that was the consequence of proper resistance.

More news appears in *The True Briton* of the 22nd, in the form of a letter from Lausanne, dated Jan. 9th (a mistake or misprint for Feb. 9th), referring to movements of rebellion preparing against the Provisional authorities set up at the end of January. This correspondent complains of the difficulties he experiences in getting news from the German part of the country. "Every communication," he says, "is interrupted and cut off; and all the Letters addressed to us from that quarter are detained and opened at Bern." There is no more reference to Switzerland in *The True Briton* until the 2nd of March, when the editor again devotes a large portion of his leading article to what he had heard was happening there. On the 6th, he gives in full General Mengaud's note to Bern of the 13th of February, as well as his Proclamation to the People of Switzerland of the 18th of the same month. Half the editorial of the 8th is again devoted to Swiss affairs, but no information later than Mengaud's Proclamation had come to hand. On the 14th of March, ten days after the fall of Bern, all the news *The True Briton* has to give its readers is a letter from Switzerland of the 23rd of February which declares that "a war with France appears no longer to be apprehended". On the 17th of March, besides further belated news dating from the end of the previous month, it prints a letter from Lausanne, written by some Vaudois patriot hostile to Bern who reports the taking of Fribourg "after a warm skirmish in which the volunteers of the Pays de Vaud deserve great praise", the taking of Soleure and the junction of the two French armies under General Brunne and General Schauenburg. Five days later, however, *The True Briton* is able to tell its readers that all the news that had been circulated concerning a Swiss defeat "appear ... to be wholly without foundation". That was on the 22nd of March.

It is clear that throughout those weeks *The True Briton* had done its best to keep its readers informed of what was taking place in Switzerland. It was apparently bent on printing reliable news only, giving a more prominent place to letters from Swiss correspondents and official or semi-official documents than to reports drawn from the French papers. The editor had been sparing in his comments. He evidently did not quite know what to think: were the Swiss freely making their own revolution, in which case of course a sound Tory could only disapprove of them, or were they being forcibly revolutionized by France? In his ignorance of the real aspect of things, he prefers not to commit himself, and his editorials of January 23

and 25, February 1, 9 and 13, March 2 and 8 are almost exclusively in the nature of summaries of events. But one thing is clear: his interest is fully aroused; and so is, no doubt, that of his readers, since he gives them all he can in the way of news and documents. Highly conservative as it was — its motto was "*Nolumus leges Angliae mutari*" — *The True Briton* might have been expected to seize the opportunity offered by these events of pouring abuse on the French. But its attitude remained uniformly objective and expectant.

The same may be said of another daily, also on the conservative side, *The Star*, in whose issues of January to March Switzerland occupies an equally prominent place.

But *The Times* was different. Young as it was in 1798, its editor, John Walter, had already raised it to the second rank among the dailies, immediately after *The Morning Chronicle*. It had already become, among all the tory papers, the chief supporter of the government. And in that capacity, it was bound to seize the opportunity Swiss events were offering of furthering the policy of Pitt and Grenville, that is of attacking the Directory for its ruthless conquests, using Switzerland as a warning to England, and urging on England the necessity of arming herself for a renewal of the struggle with France. At the same time, it evinced from the very first a strong sympathy with the Swiss whose independence it assumed was being threatened by their powerful neighbour. On the 1st of January already, in advance on all other dailies except *The Courier*, in an editorial entitled "The New Year", it observed that Switzerland was "now threatened with a revolutionary storm" and, with a rhetorical flourish, added that

the descendants of William Tell are on the point of bending their necks to the galling yoke of the disciples of Robespierre.

A week later, it denounced the policy of the Directory towards Switzerland as being obviously "the total overthrow of the Helvetic constitution", and declared it its conviction that

this overthrow must necessarily be attended with the same dreadful consequences ... as ... at other places where the Revolutionary system has diffused its influence, (the French wishing to) reduce Switzerland to the same miserable dependence to which the other States have been plunged that have unhappily come within the sphere of the revolutionary planet.

In subsequent numbers of the same month of January, now in the editorials and now in the news columns, there was a large amount of information relating to Swiss affairs. On the 28th, the editor asserted that, in his view, "the Swiss have but two means left to avoid a war; namely, either to pay heavy contributions to the Directory, or to put themselves in a respectable state of defence", which he urges them to do, also advising them "to avail themselves of the uneasiness manifested by the Northern Powers to interest them in their quarrel ...", a hint which may have

reflected the prime minister's own desire to try and help the Swiss. On the 31st, our editor informed his readers with great satisfaction that the Swiss were bent on resisting the invaders:

It is with the utmost satisfaction we inform our readers, that we have seen private letters from Switzerland ... which describe the state of the country ... There is no doubt but that the utmost energy prevails throughout Switzerland, and that the generality of the Swiss people are animated with the most fervent zeal for the defence of their rights, liberty, and independence.

But what gave our editor peculiar satisfaction was the answer of the Bern Senate to Wickham's Note, an answer that

deserves the more attention, under the present circumstances, as it proves the Helvetic body had no difficulty in publicly acknowledging the relations of amity and friendship which subsist between Switzerland and this country, at a time when the Directory makes the utmost exertions to set all Europe against the British Government ...

Passing over the issues of the first half of February, in several of which news from Switzerland was given much room and great prominence, we come to *The Times* of the 16th. Under the heading "Revolution in Switzerland", the editor, after once again contending that

Switzerland will necessarily become the theatre of all those outrages and disorders which the *great Nation* has introduced into all the countries whose ancient Government it has subverted,

draws the lesson for England:

This event must prove another powerful motive for this country to give to the public spirit, which is now manifesting itself in so patriotic and honourable a manner, all that energy which (it requires).

On the 22nd, *The Times* is happy to hear that, though the Swiss are bent upon introducing reforms,

they seem determined not to admit the interference of any foreign power, and to maintain their independence.

News became increasingly scarce with March. On the 17th, our paper stated that reports had appeared in the Paris gazettes to the effect that a battle had taken place, and that the French, after defeating their adversaries, had entered Fribourg. But on the 21st, the Hamburg mail brought reassuring intelligence and Walter could write:

The friends of the gallant Swiss will find the accounts ... less alarming than those contained in the last Paris papers. All the Swiss cantons seem to join hand and heart in the defence of their independence ... May the success of that gallant nation keep pace with the warm and unanimous wishes of all the true friends of liberty; and may the dreadful Colossus, which threatens all Europe with destruction, meet its fate among the mountains of Helvetia.

The chief daily papers on the side of the Opposition were *The Morning Chronicle*, *The Morning Post* and *The Courier*.

The Courier, which had not yet become the highly important paper it was in the latter part of the wars against Napoleon, when it had the honour of counting Mackintosh, Wordsworth and Coleridge among its contributors, had begun to give attention to Swiss affairs much earlier than any other. Owing to its strong sympathies for the Revolution, it had gladly recorded all the symptoms of the growth of a revolutionary spirit in Switzerland and, from early in July 1797 to January 1798, published news and letters from various correspondents relating such events as the conflict of the cantons with Bonaparte over the rights of free navigation on the Lake of Lugano and the hopes it raised among "Swiss patriots", i.e. Swiss revolutionists, the revolution in the Valteline and the Grisons, and Bonaparte's journey across Switzerland. It was the only paper to publish — on the 4th of January 1798 — the Directory's order of the 25th of December extending French protection to the "inhabitants of the Pays de Vaud who may apply to the French Republic in execution of former treaties, for its mediation, for the purpose of being supported or reinstated in their rights." This publication was followed on the 16th of January by a leader on the Pays de Vaud destined, according to "the last Paris papers, ... to undergo some political changes" merely because

The Swiss ... gave no portion of their Liberty to their Vaudois subjects ... *Vae Victis* were the words and manners of the compatriots of William Tell, as well as the most savage, indiscriminating Conquerors. Retributive Justice will soon overtake them. The Vaudois ... will reclaim their long-lost immunities. A little longer, and the High and Magnificent my Lords of the Canton of Berne, will cease to issue their pompous ordinances.

Characteristically, this article was placed side by side with another editorial eulogizing Bonaparte. When the news of the revolution in the Pays de Vaud reached London, *The Courier* expressed its satisfaction in glowing terms and was happy to announce that

The strong Castle of Chillon, the Bastille of the Pays de Vaud, in the dungeons of which Muller, Rosset, and so many other Patriots, had been confined since the year 1791, was taken possession of by the Patriots of Vefay on the 10th, without effusion of blood ...

On the 1st of February, *The Courier* again devoted its leading article to revolution in the Pays de Vaud, drawing from it another lesson than *The Times*, one meant for the English government:

The present situation of *Italy* and *Switzerland* will, we trust, serve as a lesson to some of the mad supporters of Mr. PITT and his War ... the despicable figure now made by those men who abused the power which they derived from the Aristocratic form of Government that prevailed in some parts of Switzerland, may teach such of our Nobility as have hitherto supported the ruinous measures of our infatuated Ministers, that there is a certain point of oppression, beyond which, in a Country, at least, where the blessings of Liberty have once been enjoyed, human force cannot go.

Five days later the editor published another leader on the government of Switzerland where, "in the principal cantons, the whole power ... is

loded in the burghers of the capital town, and the people of the country are, politically speaking, their slaves"; Bern is singled out for an elaborate denunciation based on Gibbon's essay in the character of a Swedish traveller, which is quoted extensively, and is described as holding "the fertile and populous districts" of the Pays de Vaud "in the most degrading situation of dependence"; that the people of the country should rebel against "their Lords and Masters the Burghers" was only to be expected, and "it does not appear that the Directory have interfered in the dispute", though the Swiss can only succeed in emancipating themselves "by taking advantage of the present political circumstances of Europe". And the editorial ends on these words:

The People have made several attempts to recover their rights; but every endeavour has been ineffectual, because the general Confederacy guarantees the existing form of Government in each particular State. Such a confederacy may have been long much respected in Europe but we, for our part, cannot regret its dismemberment.

From the 8th of February to the end of March, *The Courier* was content to keep its readers informed of the course of events in Switzerland, printing the same kind of news as the other daily papers. The editor himself remained silent. He did not dare to run counter to the rising wave of sympathy, and merely tried to prevent his readers being carried away by it by printing long extracts from Miss Williams's *Tour* on the state of the peasantry, "the infamous proceedings against the late General La Harpe", etc.

Both *The Morning Post* and *The Morning Chronicle* were more important papers than *The Courier*. The former had recently been bought by its printer, Daniel Stuart, Mackintosh's brother-in-law, who had made it "an exponent of bolder and more revolutionary views in politics than"⁵ most of the other papers on the same side. By 1798, it had attained the largest circulation of all dailies, over 2000. Coleridge was a regular contributor from December 1797 onwards. Stuart had secured the collaboration not only of his brother-in-law, but of nearly all the leading members of the Opposition, of Sheridan among them, though not of Fox himself whose views were more accurately reflected in *The Morning Chronicle*. *The Morning Chronicle* was universally held to be the recognized organ of the orthodox Whigs. Its position therefore was one of greater responsibility to the party. And outspoken though it was in its opposition to Pitt, it was tactful and restrained in expression. The same men wrote in both the *Post* and the *Chronicle*, but not with the same pen. The *Chronicle* had gladly published Coleridge's *Sonnets on Eminent Characters* in December 1794 and January 1795. But it would never have printed the same poet's savage attack on the prime minister in *Fire, Famine and Slaughter* which *The Morning Post* published on the 8th of January 1798.

Both papers, however, were put in the same awkward predicament by

⁵ H. R. Bourne, *English Newspapers*, i. 273.

the French aggression on Switzerland. They both claimed to be the champions of liberty and national independence. They both held the view that war had been forced on France by people intent on depriving her of the liberty she had just gained. They had both therefore long demanded that England should get out of that war. They had again and again asserted that, in what appeared to be her conquests, France had either been animated by the legitimate desire of freeing enslaved nations, or acting in self-defence. But now France seemed to be preparing to give them the lie. Neither the necessities of her defence, nor the desire of bringing liberty to slaves could possibly be put forward as excuses for the invasion of Switzerland. For the Swiss were undoubtedly a nation of free men, and their neutrality, which they had maintained for the last five years, certainly acted as a protection to France. When it became clear that the Directory had decided on the invasion of its small and peaceful neighbour, our Whig papers had to choose one of three courses: declare that no such invasion was being contemplated, renounce their championship of revolutionary France, or give up their championship of liberty. It was all very well for such an irresponsible organ of radical opinion as *The Courier* to take the first of these courses. But neither *The Morning Chronicle* nor *The Morning Post* could thus blind themselves to what were obvious facts. They had to choose between the other two, for the championship of France and the championship of liberty now appeared to be irreconcilable.

Acting rather impulsively, *The Morning Post* began by giving up its admiration for revolutionary France. On the 7th, 12th, 24th, 25th and 26th of January it had published pretty much the same news and documents as the other papers, but the editor had kept silent. At last, on the 30th, in a one-column article on "The Swiss Confederacy", he gave his own views. He told his readers that, however diverse the constitutions of the different cantons were,

in all of them the real interests of the people appear to be much attended to, and they enjoy a degree of happiness never experienced in Despotic Governments ... there is no country in which happiness and content more universally prevail among the people ... a general spirit of liberty pervades and actuates the several Constitutions.

Such being his conviction, our editor could find no justification for the French plans :

That this moral, peaceful, happy, free and unambitious country ... may repel the attacks of the French Republic, and of all other nations against her freedom, must be the sincere wish of every friend to mankind. France, indeed, will have done little service to the cause of liberty, if, after having wrested from despotic Monarchies so large a portion of their territories, she is to direct her gigantic and almost irresistible strength against the independence of nations which ... have preserved a wise, virtuous, and systematic neutrality ...

This condemnation of France, even though only conditional, must have come as a shock to many readers of the paper. Protests may have come in from

some quarters. At any rate, the editor appears to have felt it necessary to qualify his warm sympathy for the "moral, peaceful, happy, free and unambitious" Swiss. Among the news given in the early days of February, there was more than one paragraph which must have been penned by friends of the Revolution in Switzerland, as this, for instance :

The city of Nyon, worthy of serving for a model to the apostles of equality, has not only hunted away its bailiff, but ... disarmed and disbanded (a company quartered there). The seals have been put upon the gate of the bailiff's castle, and the turrets of this fort are already shadowed by the sacred branches of the tree of Liberty.

And in the editorial of the same day, Feb. 9, there was the joyful exclamation: "... the whole of Switzerland will speedily be democratized!" But, as if this was not yet enough by way of recantation, our paper published on the 12th, under the title "Revolution in Switzerland", a long special article, the work no doubt of a Frenchman, though there was nothing to warn the reader that it was not due to the editor or one of his regular collaborators — except one unguarded word towards the end —, in which Switzerland is represented as being anything but a free country, and as therefore in sore need of just such a transformation as France was willing to bring her. It begins with the assertion that

The best informed and wisest men in Switzerland agree, and loudly declare that a political change is indispensably necessary in that country

an assertion which is supported by a quotation from the historian Müller. It then passes on to an attack on the aristocracies, those "haughty, despotic, families, who call themselves privileged", and who, "by a series of perfidious and Machiavellian manoeuvres", have thrown "into shameful chains so brave a nation as the Helvetic people, who formerly performed such miracles to acquire their liberty". The writer then urges the Swiss to remember that if France by any chance were to be plunged into slavery again, the result would be

to augment the weight of those chains with which this Aristocracy oppresses the Helvetic nation. The Swiss ought to be well convinced, that, if the energy of liberty were to be extinguished in France, it would soon cease to exist on the face of the globe.

And he ends on a high-flown appeal to them to embrace the present opportunity of conquering their liberty:

O country of William Tell, you shall resume your ancient splendour! The moment of re-establishing your liberty is arrived! But take care of suffering yourself to be seduced by the falsehoods of Aristocracy! ... by what magic enchantment have they been able to persuade the free men of some cantons, that the independence of Switzerland is connected in its nature and duration with the insolent privileges of a few families of Berne ...

In the following weeks, *The Morning Post* represents Switzerland as irresistibly reforming her obsolete political institutions. The letters it

publishes, from Zürich, Basle, or the Frontiers of Switzerland, are all by friends of the Revolution. It appears determined to believe that those changes are brought about by a universal enthusiasm for the principles of 1789, by the free will of the people; and that, where they meet with opposition, it is due to the worst superstition; at Soleure, for instance, "they are so blinded by priestcraft, that some of them believe the walls of the town to be guarded by legions of invisible spirits".

On the 6th of March, however, the editor finds himself compelled to acknowledge that "the French are using threats to forward the Swiss Revolution". This impression he does not confirm in the following issues. On the contrary, he pretends to take Mengaud's declaration -- that the French have no aim beyond the establishment of democracy -- at its face-value; he prints several letters dated from the last days of February, which, as he himself points out, all "confirm the intention of the people to substitute a Democratical form of Government in room of the Aristocracy, and to preserve peace with France". At the same time, it is true, he tells his readers (on the 13th of March) that

the whole mass of the population is determined to defend its independence at the risk of the very worst which a foreign invasion can inflict.

Four days later, the French papers announcing a victory reach him. He sums up their information on the 17th. Then, on the 19th, before confirmation of that French victory has arrived, our editor throws to the winds all his pretended persuasion that the French meant no more than what they said, and with all the greater violence that he had used more restraint for the past six weeks, denounces their duplicity and rapacity :

It should seem, that out of kindness to their new allies, the Republicans were resolved to deliver Austria and Prussia from the infamy of being the most bare-faced robbers in Europe, and to furnish, by their own conduct towards Switzerland, a counterpart to the hitherto unparalleled atrocity of the partition of Poland ... The Republican plunderers are entitled to the distinction of having subverted the Constitution of a country which had for centuries enjoyed, perhaps, as much happiness and prosperity as a wise, just, and moderate Government can bestow on a brave and virtuous people ... They are to be detested as the enemies of liberty, and therefore as the enemies of mankind ... It is vain, however, to waste our time in fruitless regret, and unavailing indignation. The fate of Switzerland, deplorable as it is, furnishes a lesson, which may, perhaps, even yet be profitable to other nations of Europe ...

The lesson which *The Morning Post* drew from what then appeared the impending fate of our country was of course quite different from that drawn by *The Times* and other papers on the side of the government. They asserted that the only means to avert a similar fate for England was to be strong enough not to suffer defeat. For *The Morning Post*, the only way was through timely reform. But in spite of that important difference, the two papers, the whig and the tory, were now at one in their conviction that France, whatever she had been in the past, was now animated with a ruthless thirst of conquest which it was the duty of every

Englishman to oppose. As Coleridge amusingly put it in his *Recantation*, which the same *Morning Post* published on the 30th of July,

No quarrels now! let's all make head.
You drove the poor Ox mad.

That recantation was also that of the editor of the paper. There is no doubt that it was effected by the conduct of France towards Switzerland.

From the information it publishes from the middle of February onwards, *The Morning Chronicle* makes it quite clear that its sympathies are, as was to be expected, all on the side of the Swiss revolutionists. Its correspondents all share in the revolutionary enthusiasm. But, despite such clear sympathies with the Swiss reformers, *The Morning Chronicle*, in contradistinction to *The Morning Post*, consistently refused to admit that Switzerland really stood in need of a political change. "The Swiss were not oppressed ...", it declares on the 1st of February. And from this conviction, it never swerved. This attitude made it possible for the *Chronicle* unhesitatingly to declare in favour of the Bernese when it became known in London that they were preparing to resist the invaders. This it did in an editorial of the 28th of February:

By every account from Switzerland we learn that the Bernois seem determined to oppose the aggression of the French with firmness and spirit. Every man, who truly loves the principles of genuine freedom, must wish them success ... The Swiss are not to be ranked among the nations who have bent their necks to the sway of despotism ... What a glorious example to all people would be the soothing spectacle of a successful resistance of a Canton in Switzerland to the Nation that has over-run every Country where man has been trampled upon by his master! What a lesson to those masters themselves, since it would teach them that their own rights can only be safe by protecting the rights of others.

The Morning Chronicle could thus reconcile its support of the Swiss with its revolutionary principles. Should the Swiss succeed in repelling their invaders, those armies of the French Republic which have easily overrun the dominions of all despotic sovereigns, what a convincing proof they would give of the fact that the free citizens of a free nation possess a power which is denied to despots, and that therefore the true safety of a people lies in the freedom of its citizens.

On the 6th of March, *The Morning Post* had admitted in a single line that the Directory were using threats to forward the revolution in Switzerland. Two days later, *The Morning Chronicle* said the same thing, but in how different words!

All the accounts ... prove that a change in the constitution must take place, but they at the same time demonstrate the disgust and resentment in which the honest and simple inhabitants ... view the officious and dictatorial interference of the Directory. We sincerely hope that the French will here find that the wish of a people to amend their Government does not imply a base submission to a foreign power. We hope that the firmness of the Bernese Government and the patriotism of the people will be able to repel unjust aggression and to maintain true independence. The example of their success would be

useful to the world. It would teach nations that they may be free by their own exertions, without the dangerous expedient of resorting to foreign aid. It would teach the French to respect the independence of nations, and deprive them of that great engine of their ambition, the shallow pretence of giving liberty to others. None but weak or wicked men can encourage the pretensions of the French to be the dictators of the world, under pretence of protecting the principles of liberty.

A few days later, on the 12th, *The Morning Chronicle* again expressed in strong terms the sympathy it felt for the Swiss in their trial :

whatever fate attend their arms, should their enemies drive them to extremity, they have secured the approbation of mankind by their patriotic efforts to defend the independence of their country.

And when the first rumour of a battle in which they have behaved with gallantry has been heard, the same paper does not wait for confirmation, and summing up the position it had maintained from the first, exclaims,

What a glorious example do the Swiss thus give to the Nations of Europe ! It is not merely to the patriotism of the People that their stand is a seasonable lesson, but to the policy of the Monarchies and Aristocracies of Europe ... Would they have displayed this grand glowing energy of their spirits had they been broken, and their necks bent to the yoke of despotism ... They are brave and magnanimous, because they were never enslaved ...

*

Though, with the comparatively recent development of the daily press, the papers which came out three times a week only had somewhat sunk in importance by 1798, their influence was still far from negligible. All of them — *The London Chronicle*, *The St. James's Chronicle*, *The Whitehall Evening Post*, the *Lloyd's Evening Post* — were staunch supporters of Pitt and his policy of opposition to France and the revolutionary principles. They all devoted as much attention, comparatively speaking, as the dailies to Swiss affairs. Even *The Whitehall Evening Post*, which gave but a very small portion of its columns to foreign intelligence, would often fill that space with news relating to Switzerland. In addition to news, the *Lloyd's Evening Post* began, with its issue of February 14-16, the publication of a long article on Bern which it introduced with these words :

We are favoured by a correspondent ... with an account of the Government of the Canton of Berne which has not appeared in print. At a time when Switzerland occupies so much of the public attention, we trust it will be very acceptable to our Readers.

The article opens on an outline of Bernese history, then goes on to explain the political institutions of the old republic, and ends on a fairly detailed description of Vaud and other places, all of it being written in the traditional spirit of admiration for the country and its inhabitants. Its publication, spread over seven different numbers, was not completed until the middle of April. *The St. James's Chronicle* and *The London Chronicle* confined themselves throughout those weeks to keeping their readers

informed of the course of events. They did it in a tone of warm sympathy for our country, deploring its internal dissensions and praising the spirit of resistance it evinced. Of course they occasionally took advantage of the events to cover the French with obloquy, as when *The London Chronicle* gave expression to its hope that the Swiss

will at last succeed in maintaining their liberty, against the revolutionary banditti who intend to impose on them an ignominious yoke, and to practise in Switzerland the same system of pillage and desolation which has devastated every country hitherto invaded by their lawless bands.

*

In the autumn of the previous year Canning, who, at the age of twenty-six, had just been appointed Under-secretary for Foreign Affairs, launched a weekly paper with the definite purpose of fanning into flame the anti-French spirit which the rumours of a threatened invasion of England had at last re-awakened. In his undertaking he had two collaborators, older men, and both well-known satirists: George Ellis, who had been one of the authors of *The Rolliad*, and William Gifford, the poet of *The Baviad* and *The Maeviad*. *The Anti-Jacobin*, as they called their paper, had a short but very brilliant career. It was started on Monday the 20th of November 1797, and its last number was published on the 9th of July 1798, the aim for which it had been created having by then been fully compassed, and the country having reached such a state of warlike preparation and determination to oppose the French as it had not known since the outbreak of the war five years earlier. The purpose of Canning and his friends being to rouse Englishmen to a proper sense of the danger which French Jacobinism presented, not merely to their country, but to Europe in general, it is easy to understand that what was happening in Switzerland came most opportunely to provide them with the best of arguments. And before any other papers, *The Courier* excepted, had discovered that their readers might be interested in what was preparing, Canning was giving some Swiss news in his weekly. In the 3rd number, which he brought out exceptionally on a Thursday, the 30th of November, he published under 'Foreign Intelligence' a letter dated from Bern, Nov. 8, which shows that he was anticipating the most serious events. "Fresh demands, so this letter begins, have been made on the part of France, to the Helvetic Cantons, of a most alarming nature." On the 18th of December, after a paragraph of news from Switzerland, he declared that the country "appears to be on the brink of a revolution". Henceforth, every single number of *The Anti-Jacobin* until the 30th of April devoted large portions of its columns to Swiss affairs. True to their purpose, the editor and his collaborators were not content with keeping their readers fully informed, as far as they could, of what was happening, but endeavoured to make them see in those events one more instance of the unscrupulous greed of the French. On the 25th of December, after a batch of Swiss news dated from 'Bern, Nov. 24.', they already add this remark:

Every account from Switzerland represents the state of that Country as more and more alarming ... The French are threatening them without, and are raising up disturbances in the interior ... and it will not be long, before they pay, like every other nation which has acted in the like manner, the price of their confidence in the promises and assurances of neutrality and friendship from the French Republic.

A fortnight later, Canning and his friends already express themselves in the terms which, two months later, will be found in most of the papers :

The discussion with Switzerland seems drawing to a crisis; and a system of more atrocious and tyrannical wickedness, of more profligate and impudent contempt of Right and Justice, than marks the whole of the conduct of the Directory towards that devoted Country, the history of human arrogance and depravity cannot furnish. (January 8)

On the 15th of January, *The Anti-Jacobin* calls the occupation of Biel and the Neuveville, a detailed account of which it publishes in the form of a letter from Basle, "a new and most daring violation of the Public Law of Europe". After the news of the entrance of the French troops into Vaud has arrived, it considers "that war is now regularly declared against Switzerland" and hopes

that the remainder of Switzerland may maintain its independence; or, if it is to be erased from the List of Nations, that in the struggle it will appear not unmindful, and in its fall, not unworthy, of the character and glory of its Ancestors. (February 12)

Towards the end of February, it becomes increasingly likely that Bern at least will oppose the invaders; this fills Canning with hope that the French may not succeed in carrying out their plans. What those plans are, he once more declares in vigorous language :

If there be yet one man in *England* hardy enough to assert — if there be one blind, perverse, or stupid enough to believe that there is any thing in the views, and policy of the French Rulers, short of the utter and final destruction of every existing Government ... let him pause on the picture which Switzerland now exhibits. ... Absolute extermination of the Government — unqualified enslavement of the People — such are the only sacrifices by which the peaceable and innocent Swiss are required to expiate the crime of having been till now tranquil and happy ... If there be in that Country, the spirit and patriotism which every History of former times, and every recent account, gives us reason to believe, we cannot but still indulge the hope, that strength and energy enough may be found, or created there, to resist effectually the further invasion of the French armies. We cannot but hope that the Government of Bern may yet succeed in collecting round itself such a force, as may ensure its own safety; while it will hold out to the World one example at least, of what may be done even with means comparatively small, by Men determined to struggle to the last in the cause of their Country; and if their Country must ultimately fall, rather to bury themselves in its ruins, than to become the tame spectators of its shame, the accomplices and slaves of its oppressors. (Feb. 26)

On the 5th and 6th of March, *The Anti-Jacobin* is still full of hope that the Bernese resistance may be effectual :

We have learnt nothing ... that induces us to abandon the hope ... that Berne may yet display, in its own defence, an energy worthy of the Swiss name.

The absence of news in what French papers have come to hand by the 12th, it interprets as meaning that the resistance which the French encounter is much beyond their calculation. Analysing Lucerne's note to Mengaud, it declares that the firmness and determination, together with the sober and sound reason which that note breathes,

affords no small hopes of the ultimate success of that Country in the struggle in which French violence and wickedness are likely to engage them. (March 12)

On the 19th, when from the reports in the Paris gazettes the progress of the French armies appears to have been more rapid than *The Anti-Jacobin* had anticipated, as the editor is "grieved to say", he observes that the conduct of the French to Switzerland is universally condemned :

We are happy to see that the revolting and undisguised wickedness and atrocity of the conduct of the Directory has not found, *even in this Country*, where all acts of French perfidy, French barbarity, and French oppression, have uniformly been defended to the last ... we are happy to find that in the present instance, the conduct of the French to Switzerland has not yet found one panegyrist.

And in spite of what may have happened, he

cannot but still indulge the hope, that the resistance likely to be experienced by the French Army in some of the Cantons, may give them reason to repent of the temerity and wickedness of their conduct.

But whatever the issue of the campaign, the French invasion of Switzerland is a fact which no one now can possibly refuse to see, and the lesson it contains must not be lost to England. And Canning concludes his long editorial in a manner well calculated to bring that lesson home :

The Lesson that these circumstances speak to this Country, is too plain to be misunderstood, and too awful to be neglected.

Is France *now* capable of waging a War of aggression ?

Is she *now* defending herself against a Confederacy of Despots ?

Is she *now* fighting not for Aggrandizement, but for Self-preservation ?

Is she *now* anxious for Peace which her enemies refuse her ?

Will Mr. Fox *now* avow these doctrines, by which he has for years misled the judgment of a small portion of the Country ? And if he is (as he must be), heartily ashamed of them, why has he not the manliness and honesty to come down to the House of Commons, and in the face of his Country to recant and to disclaim them ?

★

This review of the press is enough to show what widespread and deep interest public opinion in England was taking in Swiss affairs in those early weeks of 1798. No doubt that interest was not altogether disinterested. The adversaries of the Revolution were only too happy to seize, and improve upon, the occasion of exposing what they called the infamous conduct of France. But when we see all papers devote so much room and so many leading articles to the invasion of Switzerland, we must admit that, on the part of many at least, that interest was spontaneous and genuine.

And, as so many of our quotations have shown, it was almost universally accompanied by warm sympathy.

Such being the state of public opinion, nothing could be more natural than that, when the news of the total defeat of the Swiss armies, of the fall of Bern, of what appeared to be the final overthrow of Switzerland, at last reached London, England should have been stirred as she had not been by any news since the beginning of the Revolution. The sorrow and indignation universally, or almost universally felt, together with the admiration excited by what was called the heroic conduct of the Swiss, found expression in most papers and periodicals. This is what *The Times* says, on the 24th of March :

... the Paris Gazettes ... inform us of the melancholy fate of the brave People of Switzerland, for whose success against the Vandals of the 18th century every friend to Liberty offered up his prayers. But in yielding to their ferocious enemies, the Swiss have died in the Field of Glory, bravely defending whatever is most dear and sacred to man.

In reading the different official Documents which the Directory has published on the subject of its new triumphs, the mind is filled with indignation at the impudent pretexts offered by the barbarous invader for his atrocities ...

In the Message of the Directory, we find the subjugation of Switzerland to be considered as a *signal victory gained over England* ...

The Directory is therefore not mistaken as to the lively interest we take in the unfortunate State of Switzerland. No people on earth is better qualified than the English to appreciate the liberty enjoyed by the once happy Swiss for upwards of two centuries; no other nation can therefore be so deeply affected as the English at seeing this gallant People overcome. But the more we are affected by the calamitous fate of our ancient friends, the more strongly we feel it incumbent on every Briton to unite and act with redoubled energy against these atrocious Conquerors ... who would desolate this Land of Liberty...

The Morning Chronicle celebrates in fine and moving terms the soldiers who have fallen in the defence of their country in the editorial of the same 24th of March, which is wholly given to Switzerland :

The conduct of the Swiss troops is admitted by their enemies themselves to have been heroic ... Some of the traits which the French papers contain of the gallantry of the Swiss troops and their leaders, cannot be read without exciting the strongest emotions of generous sympathy ... We regret that so much bravery should have been exerted in vain, and we consecrate the greatness of the sacrifice and the dignity of the example. We feel that in such a cause the laurels of victory may belong to the victors, but the honour to the vanquished. Those who struggled and fell for the defence of their country, must be dear to all who prize the virtues which belong to citizens ... They fell ... but they will be esteemed the martyrs of liberty, and be classed with the noblest patriots of ancient times

... pulcherrima proles
Magnanimi heroes, nati melioribus annis.

Similar tributes were to be read in nearly all the papers. "Those who have fallen, may truly be said to have died in the field of glory, bravely defending whatever is most dear and sacred to man", wrote *Lloyd's Evening Post*. *The London Chronicle* observed with profound admiration that the Swiss women had fought in the first rank. *The Anti-Jacobin* of the 26th described the news as

truly afflicting to every mind that felt (as who must not have felt, that has a spark of honour, of generosity, or of respect for valour and for virtue?) an anxious interest in the success of a brave People fighting for all that is dear to them

and emphasized the fact that the Swiss had fought with "a bravery worthy of the race and of the cause".

To this chorus of sincere sympathy there was but one exception, only one paper which, in the words of *The Anti-Jacobin*, "dissented from the general feeling, and uttered a savage howl of exultation over the mangled bodies of those brave Defenders of their Country", namely *The Courier*. This paper broke its long editorial silence on the last day in March with a long leader throwing ridicule on the resistance of the Swiss, those "poor Peasants who have been thrust into the cannon's mouth by the Magnificent Lords of Berne", and asserting that "the little Despots of that Canton" had "in vain ... urged the brave People of Switzerland to support their tyrannic claims".

In the meantime the gallantry of the Swiss had caused a very general hope to be entertained that it would not be spent in vain, that the fall of Bern would not spell the final subjugation of the whole country, that the Swiss might rally still and defeat their opponents. On the 26th of March, *The Star*, after insisting on "the most extraordinary courage" displayed by the Swiss who "evinced a contempt of danger and death which was never surpassed", declares :

The spirit of the people ... shows that the French ... have not subdued the country. Their conquest cannot be secure, while this spirit remains ... This perhaps is a faint hope, but it is one which those who are friends to the independence of nations, who are admirers of that patriotic ardour by which the Swiss are animated must be unwilling to abandon.

The True Briton of the 29th writes likewise :

We sincerely hope that the manifestation of this gallant spirit will be productive of the most beneficial effect; and that the Swiss will finally triumph ...

On that day, as we learn from *The Morning Post* of the 30th, "a report prevailed very generally in the City, and it was believed at Court, that the Swiss had defeated the French with great slaughter". As late as the 31st, *The True Briton* could write in its editorial that "a very great resistance" might yet be expected.⁶

★

⁶ The monthly reviews often appeared with considerable delays, so that their numbers for January, February, March and April 1798 can hardly be considered as contributing to the formation of public opinion during those months. A brief reference to them is all therefore that is necessary here. One of them only, *The Monthly Review*, which was of distinctly revolutionary principles, greeted with satisfaction, in its February number, the news that "those modern principles of government, which the crowned heads of Europe united their forces to destroy, have at length reached the mountains of ancient Helvetia", and, in its March number, congratulated the French on having fixed "the

Before the end of March, both in the House of Lords and in the House of Commons, the fate of Switzerland had been evoked, and the sympathy of the English Parliament and Government expressed in a becoming manner. On the 27th, the Secretary for War, Dundas, introduced his bill for the more effectual protection of the realm against the danger of invasion. Towards the end of his speech, he used the argument which the papers on the government's side had been using for some weeks: let events in Switzerland be a warning to England!

I will not refer, he said, to what has passed in Flanders and Holland, the circumstances with respect to those countries are obliterated by the more recent conduct of the French: wherever they have appeared, under the name of friendship, they have assumed the character of conquerors. Venice, Genoa, Naples, and Rome, are proofs of what is to be expected from the friendship of France ... But above all, there is a recent circumstance, which it is impossible to pass over on a day such as this, when I am endeavouring to call forth the zeal, the spirit and the valour of the country. It is impossible for the House not to see I refer to the inhumanity exercised to that ill-used nation of heroes, of virtuous heroes, the Swiss Cantons. We all know that with robbers' hands, without any provocation, they have attacked that virtuous people, who have studiously avoided every way by which offence could be given, who have struggled to preserve a pure neutrality amidst the convulsions of Europe; yet, because they were neutral, because they gave no provocation, they have provoked the hatred of the French, who now, under the walls of Berne, think themselves at liberty to drink ruin to Great Britain, who are boasting that every battle gained in Switzerland is an advantage over Great Britain.⁷

Speaking in support of the bill, Sir William Pulteney expressed his conviction that the spirit of the country would be raised to such a pitch that it would suffice to remove any idea of danger, and declared that

the example of that glorious spirit which lately displayed itself in Switzerland, together with the behaviour of the French towards the virtuous inhabitants of that country, ought to animate every man in Great Britain ... There never was a period (he went on to say, in which the situation of the Swiss might be supposed to be more desperate than that

banners of liberty and equality upon the ruins of the Aristocracies of Berne and Fribourg" and called the Swiss troops who had done their best to oppose the invaders of their country "the fanatic bands of oligarchy". *The Universal Magazine of Knowledge and Pleasure* was non-committal, merely giving news and documents. But all the other reviews warmly expressed their indignation and sympathy. *The Gentleman's Magazine* for January referred with approval to the preparations the Swiss appeared to be making to resist the aggressions of the French, and, in its March number published a full account of the "several obstinate and bloody conflicts, in which the Swiss fought with the most determined bravery ... recalling the classic pictures which history presents of devoted attachment to the cause of liberty and our country". *The Analytical Review*, in its March number, asserted its confidence that, though defeated, the Swiss would recover their liberty, "for the tree of liberty is not to be eradicated from mountains so bold, inaccessible, and sublime. The natural elements are a hedge around it; the winds of heaven have charge of its seed". In the meantime, the vanquished could count on "the sympathy and vows of all good and wise men". *The European Magazine and London Review* for April insisted on the patriotism of the "Patrician youth of Berne, who ... fought till the last individual among them was slain ..."

⁷ *The Senator: or Parliamentary Chronicle*, vol. xx, p. 704.

in which they were placed at present. Surrounded on all sides, assisted by no one, attacked by a country so superior in population, yet with all these disadvantages Switzerland had not sunk under her situation. Five times had she rallied against the French troops; and the French General himself had spoken in terms of admiration and wonder at the opposition made by this gallant people, who had not been engaged in wars for two hundred years ... he hoped they would still be successful in defending their country.⁸

Pulteney added that the fate of Switzerland had surely opened the eyes even of former sympathisers with the Revolution:

Whatever opinion might have been once entertained concerning the French, by numbers of people, he would venture to say that they were changed, and that scarcely any persons thought favourably of them at present ... since there was no circumstance that could serve to rouse the spirit and indignation of the country more effectually than the recent example of Switzerland.⁹

And before sitting down, he asked the House that the present indignation should "be marked in the strongest manner by some public measure ..."

To another member who had also said that "he felt as much for the Swiss as any man" but had asked whether their present calamities had not been caused by their lack of union, Pitt answered that he believed they were rather due to the Swiss allowing themselves to be influenced by the French democracy, and also seized the opportunity of voicing his sincere hope that their present resistance was not too late, and his admiration for the patriotic heroism and gallant ardour they were displaying.

Two days later, on the 28th of March, in the House of Lords, previous to the order of the day being read, Lord Carlisle rose, and apologizing to their Lordships for remarking upon a subject which was not before the House, said it was one of so great importance that he must take the earliest opportunity of calling their attention to it. He was referring, he said,

to the wanton, unprovoked, and most unjustifiable irruption made by the French in the territories of Switzerland.

In his opinion, that country had "done more to stop the deluge which seemed to menace all Europe, than any other quarter of the Globe, England excepted". And he hoped something might yet be done to help it in its present critical situation,

before that free, and once independent people were entirely crushed. The applause of the House, even the bare, empty applause, might afford some satisfaction to that brave people; and if nothing more was done, still the general approbation of this country might be to them some consolation. But if any mode could be suggested of effectually assisting them, it would be matter of the sincerest satisfaction.¹⁰

Answering Carlisle, Grenville, the Secretary for Foreign Affairs, observed that, on such an occasion, and upon so very important a subject, no sort of

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 708.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 709.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 718.

apology was necessary. The noble Earl had expressed himself as every man inhabiting a free country, and enjoying the blessings of a free constitution, must feel, at beholding the state to which the wanton and unprovoked aggression of the common enemy had reduced a free, peaceable, and unoffending people. And Grenville added that the House would soon be given the opportunity of regularly adverting to the subject, and that

he felt much satisfaction in finding it touched upon in both Houses of Parliament because it must be a matter of much consolation to that much aggrieved and injured people, to find that in Great Britain, there existed but one sentiment and that decidedly in their favour.

The only assistance which England could render the Swiss was to prevent the French from robbing them of the very large sums of money which some of the Cantons and many private persons had invested in Great Britain. A Swiss Property Bill was introduced by the Government on the 18th of April and became law on the 10th of May.¹¹

*

The hope, expressed both in the papers and in Parliament, in the last days of March, that the resistance of the Swiss to the invaders of their country might still be successful, had soon to be abandoned. Then even *The Morning Post* gave expression to feelings of compassion and indignation in a leading article of the 2nd of April, in its news columns of the 3rd, 10th and 11th, and crowned it all by the publication of Coleridge's *France: an Ode*.¹²

Our review of the London press during the three months that preceded the publication of that Ode has surely brought home to those who have had the patience to follow us the fact that the final conversion of Coleridge to anti-revolutionary views was but one manifestation, among many others, of a very deep and very general movement of public opinion called forth by the French invasion of Switzerland.

Lausanne.

G. BONNARD.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 927, 960, 999.

¹² The original title *The Recantation: an Ode* was changed in 1802.

Notes and News

(To be) Due as a (Passive) Verb-Equivalent

I am not here concerned with the construction of the adj. 'due' with an infinitive listed by the NED. Supplement as a US. colloquialism: 'they were about due to find out' (= on the point of finding out), in which 'to be due' might be taken as a modern auxiliary, for this construction seems to have been generally introduced into Great Britain by now: 'the train was due to arrive'. My concern is rather with the phrase 'to be due' as a kind of passive verb-equivalent. In my article on 'to owe' (*E. S.*, Vol. XIX, No. 3, p. 99) I had already brought the phrase into some organic connexion with the verbs governing a two non-prepositional object construction when refuting Jespersen's contention that the passive (i.e. the primary passive conversion, to be exact) of the verb 'to owe' was unidiomatic, Jespersen maintaining that it was more usual to say 'is due to', or 'is owing to'¹ instead of 'is owed to'.

Since I wrote the above article several additional examples have come to hand to prove that both the primary and secondary passive conversions of 'to owe' seem current to-day (especially the primary one). I shall give two more examples here: (Whittington) is seen (sc. in the painting) at a banquet, throwing into a fire bonds of a *debt owed to him* by Henry V.²; practically no one in the US. is aware that *this country* (Great Britain) *is owed one penny piece* on account of the War³. Far more interesting to me was the fact revealed by two stray examples found in recent texts that (on the analogy of the secondary passive conversion of 'to owe': 'I am owed something', it seems) a corresponding sec. pass. conv. was used even in the case of 'to be due': '*I am due something*'. The first example I came across (which I was inclined to regard as a misprint) was offered by a *Times* correspondent in a causerie⁴ entitled 'A Street Casualty. From Omnibus to Hospital'. The correspondent related how she had slipped and stumbled when stepping off the pavement on to the greasy road, and had broken her ankle. She was taken to hospital by a policeman, who had tied up her leg to a bit of packing-case. Now she continues: 'In the hospital two inexperienced students tried their powers of diagnosis. The policeman stood by definitely offended. *He was due*, by regulation, a *report* on the efficiency of his first aid, and he did not think these two were capable of giving it.' I approached Mr. Frederick T. Wood of Sheffield, who is no stranger to the readers of *E. S.*, on the subject, and he was kind enough to make enquiries about this construction,

¹ Ever 'outstanding' might be added as interchangeable: (a debt) outstanding to this country from Austria (B.B.C. news bulletin, 2.5.1938).

² *Radio Times*, 4.3.1938, p. 93.

³ letter to the *Times*, 3.9.1938, p. 6 (American).

⁴ *Times*, 17.12.1937, p. 19.

with which he is himself unacquainted. This is what he writes:⁵ 'I have been making as wide inquiries as possible about the curious use of the verb 'to be due' which you quote. Like yourself, I am doubtful whether it is a mis-print, but I cannot find anyone who will state definitely that they are acquainted with it as a colloquialism. When I asked different people whether they would use, or had ever heard anyone else use, such an expression as *He is due a rise in salary* at the end of the year (a comparable construction), most were quite definite that they had not. A few, however, had a vague kind of suspicion that they had, but were not at all certain about it. So far as I know, I have never heard it. The usual expression is: *He is due for a rise in salary* etc. I should be inclined to say that the construction you have come across is a peculiarity personal to the lady in question. In any case, I doubt whether she should really have used the verb 'to be due' at all in this context; to be *entitled to* would be more correct. *To be due for* something rather suggests that one can look forward to it with confidence in the natural course of things, but not necessarily that he has a right to it by law or regulations, and I take it it was in this latter sense that the policeman viewed his report.'

In the light of the fact that the construction seems current in USA (see further down) I am inclined, however, to regard the above example in the Times as conclusive evidence that it is also used today in Great Britain (although I have so far only come across a single example), the more so since even some of Mr. Wood's acquaintances 'had a vague suspicion that they had heard it used.'

It is highly instructive that an American friend to whom I had put the same question whether it was permissible to say: 'he is due a rise in salary' seemed not to have taken any exception whatever to this construction. What he objected to was merely the use of 'rise'! Here is his reply: "As to 'he is due a rise in salary' for 'he should be given a rise in salary': Instead of the word 'rise', the word 'raise' is more commonly used; although I won't say it is more correct. The most correct word in this connection would be 'increase': *He is due an increase in salary*." This seems to establish the usage for the US. as current.

Since then I have come across another example. It occurs in a rhymed letter to the B.B.C. Empire Broadcasting Programme, June 4-10, 1939, p. 2, entitled: 'How Should the Announcers Pronounce Newfoundland?' evidently sent by a listener in Newfoundland: "... They have no trouble with 'Samarkand'; But find it hard to say Newfound Land. *They're due a bit of a reprimand* For boggling so over Newfound Land...".

Since 'owing' and 'due' seem interchangeable (see above), the almost invariable US. dropping of the preposition 'to' after 'due' may have been suggested by constructions such as: 'the money that was owing him' (but

⁵ January 28, 1938. I belatedly take the opportunity of thanking Mr. Wood cordially for his help.

cp. also the American construction: 'his astonishment was equal their own'). Examples abound. The following may suffice: the consideration *due her innocence* of the world.⁶

Jena.

G. KIRCHNER.

War Words. Our note on *evacuees*¹ in the December number has induced one reader, Miss H. W. Schalkwijk, of Rotterdam, to send us a batch of examples of this and other war words, for which we express our sincere thanks. The following instances are of particular interest:

Attributive use of *evacuee*: "Some evacuee mothers have complained" (Picture Post, Nov.); "Parents visited their evacuee children in the reception areas" (B.B.C., Dec. 3.). — Humorous nonce-derivative: "Study in *Evacuese*" (Punch, Nov.); cf. *journalese*, *Johnsonese*. — Abbreviation: "*vackies*" = evacuees (N.R.C., Dec. 23, article by London correspondent).

Words belonging to the same sphere: *foster-father* and *foster-mother*, for hosts of evacuated children (Picture Post, Nov.). — "Thousands of evacuees are *billeted* in country houses"; "*Billeters* complain that the children are unruly" (ibid.). Of course these are not new terms, but old words to which the war has given special significance; while the sense in which *billeters* is used in the last quotation is not recorded in the OED.

The *black-out* (of pre-war, though recent, origin) appears to produce "Black-Out Eyestrain", for which a treatment is advertised in a December number of Punch. According to a November number of the same paper, "we must still endure the totally *black-outed* nights", while a private correspondent writes that "all windows have to be black outed." (We may add that the Times Literary Supplement of Jan. 6, 1940, writes of a new detective story as "the very thing to absorb our attention on snowbound, *black-outed* evenings.")

The *gas-mask* (dating from the last war, though now extended to civilians) requires a *gas-mask container*, *gas-mask carrier*, or, more genteelly, a *respirator satchel*. "The queen carried her own gas-mask in a *satchel*." Other names are *gas-mask box* (Punch, Nov. 1) and *respirator container* (ibid., Nov. 8).

We shall be glad to receive further materials, with exact indication of source and date. Note also the new portmanteau word '*nāvicert* = nāval certificate (B.B.C.). — Z.

⁶ Short History of American Literature (Trent, Erskine etc.), p. 282.

¹ That *evacuee* is not the only unorthodox derivative in -ee appears from the following quotation from a prospectus of *Who's Who 1940*: "Every *biographee* has had a proof of his or her entry to bring it completely up to date."

Oxford Dictionary of Modern English. According to the T.L.S. of Nov. 4, 1939, the Oxford University Press has in advanced preparation a large dictionary in one volume confined to modern English. The plan for such an "unconcise dictionary" was conceived by the late H. W. Fowler and developed by his younger brother, the late A. J. Fowler, who, in collaboration with H. G. Le Mesurier, worked at it until taken ill about half a year ago. The dictionary, when completed, should be of great interest to continental students of English.

J. A. Falconer †. We regret to announce the death, on December 30, 1939, of Mr. J. A. Falconer, M.A., who had been lecturer on English literature at the University of Groningen since 1913. Mr. Falconer contributed several articles and reviews to *English Studies* and other periodicals. Among his best publications in this journal are those on Charlotte Brontë's *The Professor* and *Villette* (1927), Dorothy Osborne and William Temple (1931), and Sir Walter Scott (1932-1939).

R. B. McKerrow †. When reviewing Dr. McKerrow's *Prolegomena for the Oxford Shakespeare* in our August number last year, we expressed the hope that we should not have to wait long for the appearance of the first volumes. The fulfilment of this wish will be inevitably delayed, we are afraid, by the Editor's untimely death on or about January 20. Dr. McKerrow's name will be for ever associated with the study of English literature by his edition of the writings of Thomas Nash, and by his conduct of the *Review of English Studies*. His death is an incalculable loss to Elizabethan scholarship.

Reviews

En Sprogmands Levned. By OTTO JESPERSEN. 247 pp. + five plates. København: Gyldendal. 1938. Dan. Cr. 8.75.

The title of the book may perhaps be rendered by "The Life of a Linguist", but the rendering would not be quite accurate. The word *Sprogmand*, which Jespersen uses in self-characterisation, is not really covered by "linguist" or "philologist". It literally means "language man", and the author tells us in his preface that he has chosen the word rather than *Sprogforsker* "student of languages", because he wants to stress the fact that he is not merely a linguist and philologist, but has also given much

time and interest to the teaching of languages and to the making of language (i.e. an international auxiliary language).

It is not possible here to give a full account of this remarkable book, but a few points in it will be selected for some comment.

Jespersen's early history in more ways than one gives a clue to his development and personality as a scholar. He lost his father early and had to finance his university studies largely by his own work. He began early to teach, both privately and in schools, and for many years he was a shorthand reporter in the Danish diet (riksdag). The independence that is such a marked characteristic of Jespersen as a scholar, was doubtless innate, but it must have been accentuated by the necessity for self-dependency in economic matters from an early age. His interest in the teaching of languages, not least elementary teaching, is partly explained by the fact that he began at an early and impressible age to take up teaching and to think over teaching methods. Endowed with a remarkably critical mind, he saw the defects of earlier methods and earlier handbooks, and he soon began to devise improvements and to write better handbooks. He started as a student of law, but after a couple of years changed over to philology. The first language he took up was French, and he has always retained a warm affection for that language.

Jespersen is a central figure in modern linguistics and philology, and during his extensive travels he has come into contact with a great number of people, not only philologists and scholars generally, but with all sorts of people. What he has to tell us about well-known personalities, who are mostly names only to the present generation, is of the highest interest. I will particularly point to the accounts of the three English scholars Ellis, Sweet, and Furnivall. Of the three I have met Dr. Furnivall, and I can testify to the accuracy of many of the entertaining facts concerning him in Jespersen's book. The account of Jespersen's relations with Sweet is of engrossing interest; it tallies with what I have heard of Sweet from other sources. The strong and the weak points of this great scholar are thrown into relief, and one understands better why he never got the recognition he deserved in his own country.

With particular zest Jespersen dwells upon his American journeys, especially the first, and he throws a good deal of light on American school and university life. The auxiliary language movement has had a strong advocate in him, and it receives much space and attention. The chapters on it contain inside information which will interest many readers.

A chapter that will fascinate a great circle of readers is that in which Jespersen tells us about his own methods of work, the result of many years of experiment and trial. One salient characteristic of Jespersen as a scholar is his sound common sense, and the practical hints he throws out are worthy of the utmost attention on the part of younger scholars.

Altogether the book is a fascinating human document. The great scholar tells us unreservedly about himself, not only about his experiences and his methods of work, but also about his political views and his religious

convictions, and he tries to analyse his own character and personality, as he sees them himself. There is a good deal of self-confession already in Jespersen's farewell lecture at the university in 1925, which is available in English translation in *Linguistica*, pp. 1 ff. It is to be hoped that an English edition will make also the Autobiography accessible to a wider circle than it can command in its Danish garb.

Lund.

EILERT EKWALL.

Jack and Jill. A Study in Our Christian Names. By ERNEST WEEKLEY. xii + 193 pp. London: John Murray. 1939. 5s. net.

Another book from Prof. Weekley's pen, which the learned author by his own confession, like Mme de Sévigné, "laisse trotter", without allowing it to run away with him, means an additional pleasure for those who have learned to appreciate Prof. Weekley's entertaining as well as instructive guidance about the delectable fields of word-lore, even though — or perhaps chiefly because — in the author's own words, his guidance is "neither methodical nor 'scientific'". This can only mean that it has always been the author's aim to write the results of his philological studies so as to make them accessible and palatable to the general reader, thus rousing the latter's interest in the subject instead of deterring him from increasing his general knowledge. The more fascinating the book, the wider the circle of its readers, and so long as the author does not sacrifice fact to fiction for the sake of popularity — and this is the last thing that can be said of Prof. Weekley — he may render a great service to science by converting interested readers to serious students of a subject which till then they had left severely alone.

In *Jack and Jill* — the familiar equivalents of *John* and *Juliana* — Prof. Weekley discusses in some ten chapters the sense and origin of no fewer than 1465 Christian names, as appears from the *Index*, and yet the book does not and cannot contain all Christian names now in use, for those of Biblical origin, especially, the author has found to be "rather a job lot", while the constant occurrence of new and fantastic female names will always bar the way to completion. No genuine name in familiar use, however, has been omitted, which proves that Prof. Weekley has turned to good account the exceptional opportunities for accumulating and considering Christian names which half a century of teaching and examining has afforded him.

In the Introductory Chapter the author tells us how he "put his foot in it" as a young schoolmaster, when he asked a new boy of Jewish race and faith what his 'Christian name' was, adding: "This use of the word 'Christian' seems to be peculiar in English". In form it is, but not in sense, for, like Fr. *nom de baptême*, Ger. *Taufname*, Du. *doopnaam*, 'Christian name' also means 'baptismal name', *Christian* being a corruption of M.E.

cristen, the stem of the verb *cristen*, O.E. *cristn-ian* 'to baptize', mod. Eng. 'to christen'.¹ The form with *Ch-* and *-ia-* of the verbal noun must be owing to assimilation to the sb. or adj. *Christian*, older *cristen*, itself assimilated to the original Latin *Christian-us*. If only the convenient neutral *Forename* had survived, as have Fr. *Prénom*, Ger. *Vorname*, Du. *Voornaam*, all after Lat. *Prænomen*, misapplication of the term *Christian name* might easily be avoided.

By far the longest chapter, headed "Saxon and Norman and Dane are We", deals with names of Teutonic, i.e. Anglo-Saxon, Old Norse, or Old German (*via* Norman-French) origin.² They form the majority of names in common use from the coming of Hengest and Horsa (5th century) to the time of the Plantagenets (12th-15th c.), when they began to feel the competition of the Saints (Ch. III).

The three closely related Teutonic languages contributed names which were largely made up of similar elements with slight differences in form and sound. Names derived from the god *Thor*, such as *Thurstan*, come from Old Norse; *Æthel-* or *Ethel-*, noble, was very popular with the Anglo-Saxons, and *Hrod-*, famous, as in *Robert*, *Roger*, with the Continental Germans.

The normal Teutonic name was dithematic, i.e. it consisted of two significant elements linked together with nothing to show any grammatical relation between them, e.g. *Ethelbert*, A.S. *Æthelbeorht*, noble bright, corresponds to O.G. *Adalberaht*, whence *Adelbert*, and the mod. Ger. *Albrecht*, which reached England as *Albert* with the Prince Consort, which name, in spite of Charlotte Yonge's³ prophesy, has not become one of the most frequent of English national names.

That many of the Teutonic elements thus used could be reversed, is shown by the A.S. names *Hereweald*, army-rule, mod. Eng. *Harold*, and the identical *Wealdhere*, rule-army, mod. Eng. *Walter*. *Harold*, however, is chiefly from Norse or Danish, and *Walter* reached England *via* France from Old German. Some of the elements, such as *æthel* and *theod*, people, tribe, were used only initially, and others, such as *mund*, protection, only finally, but many of those enumerated by the author (pp. 29, 30) could occupy either position.

By the 14th century Anglo-Saxon names had practically died out, except for the two royal saints *Edmund* and *Edward*. Some, such as *Edgar* and *Alfred*, are revivals. Others, such as *Godwin* or *Goodwin*, *Goldwin*, *Herrick*, A.S. *hereric*, *Kennard*, A.S. *Cyneheard*, and *Maynard*, A.S. *Mægneheard*, might-strong, survive as surnames.

¹ From this it will be clear that we do not agree either with O.E.D., where *Christian* is regarded as an adjective, or with Prof. Weekley, to whom it seems likely to be a corruption of the obsolete *christened*.

² On this subject see a recent book by H. B. Woolf, *The Old Germanic Principles of Name-Giving* (Baltimore, 1939). — Ed.

³ M. Charlotte Yonge: *History of Christian Names* (2nd ed., London, 1884), one of Prof. Weekley's sources.

As in France early in the Middle Ages, so in England the belief in the protective powers of the canonized was so real, that the Old Teutonic names began to give way to those of the Saints. Even such stalwarts as *William*, *Robert* and *Richard* would, according to the author, hardly have survived so hardily, if they had not named saints as well as historical characters.

The Renaissance brought a great influx of Greek and Roman names, attacked as "savouring of paganism" by a 16th century very fervent Puritan. Many Puritan ministers refused to baptize infants by the traditional *William*, *Richard*, *Robert*, etc., though one of the more broad-minded of them admitted that 'he knew *Williams* and *Richards* who, though they bore names not found in sacred story, but familiar to the country, were as gracious saints as any who bore names found in it'.

The Reformation brought about a complete change, for the Puritans 'presumably hated the Devil, but they hated the saints still more'. In addition to the 'glorious company of the apostles and the noble army of martyrs' most of the old Teutonic names also vanished from their nomenclature, 'for were not many of these also tainted with sanctity?' To their daughters the Puritans were fond of giving such abstract names as *Charity*, *Faith*, *Fortune*, *Grace*, *Love*, *Mercy*, *Patience*, *Prudence*, *Temperance*, etc. The Puritan craze for Old Testament names in many cases led to cruelty to their children, who received the most repulsive Christian names. To this baptismal cruelty, impossible in Roman Catholic countries, where the officiating priest would certainly refuse to christen a child by an objectionable or ridiculous name, there seems to be, according to the author, no limit in England.

Another cruelty to children is burdening them with an accumulation of names, an extreme development of the modern habit of giving a child more than one Christian name. The double name was very rare before the 18th century, while triple, quadruple, etc. names were almost unknown before the 19th. The most idiotic example of a multiple name is certainly the one quoted by the author of a Miss Pepper, born at Liverpool in 1880, who had 25 Christian names given to her, each beginning with a different letter of the alphabet, with the exception of P, the initial of her surname. The parents of a Mr. Ayres of Prestwood, Bucks., who died in 1933, took a short-cut to 25 Christian names for their son, when they had him christened *Alphabet*.

The practice of giving double names came from France, where it is very old, through Scotland in the 17th century. From this has developed the 'middle name', which in modern America "has become almost compulsory and (is) most usually ... a surname". Some of the best known examples are Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, John Lothrop Motley, Oliver Wendell Holmes, James Fenimore Cooper, William Makepeace Thackeray, Thomas Babington Macaulay, William Ewart Gladstone, etc. In the case of many of these it is especially the 'middle name' by which the bearer is known and referred to, e.g. *Fenimore Cooper*, *Woodrow Wilson*, *Lloyd George*, *Ramsay Macdonald*, *Rider Haggard*. When a surname stands alone as

a Christian name, it is nearly always included, e.g. *Rudyard Kipling*, *Upton Sinclair*, etc. We sometimes find a female name as a man's middle name, e.g. *Francis Marion Crawford*.

There are many more interesting and entertaining passages in this book. Only lack of space prevents us from including them in this review, which we conclude by expressing a wish that Prof. Weekley may enjoy the leisure of retirement long enough to write some more books of the kind for the amusement of himself, the benefit of his readers and the advancement of the science of words and names.

Arnhem.

J. F. BENSE.

Rare Poems of the Seventeenth Century. Chosen and Edited by L. BIRKETT MARSHALL. viii + 234 pp. London: The Cambridge University Press. 1936. 7s. 6d. net.

Anthologies of this kind usually require an apology from the compiler or the reviewer, but the present volume is a brilliant exception. Dr. Marshall has collected representative specimens from the work of fifty almost unknown poets with a handful of anonymous pieces which, and this is significant, are considerably less interesting than the acknowledged poems.

It is true that there is a good deal of seventeenth-century conventionalism in these poems: phoenix nests, cheeks which are strawberries and cream, or coral, and breasts which are lilies or nunneries, but when Dr. Marshall says that "in almost every case the poems have been chosen for some poetic merit," he is making no idle boast. To my mind the religious poems of John Collop are the most valuable things reprinted here. *The Leper Cleans'd* and *On the Resurrection* are powerful, earnest, terrible, and have all the originality of strong personal experience and an individual talent for words. The poems by Thomas Fletcher are almost equally interesting by virtue of the originality of their technique. He makes striking use of assonance:

Believe, Posterity, believe it true
This from no fancied Form the Pencil drew;
No Angel sat with lucid Visions sent
To bless the Eyes of some departing Saint.
No, all the Charms which on this Picture dwell,
(And ah! what pity 'tis), were mortal all.

Ralph Knevet, tutor to the Pastons, is represented by fourteen competent Lyrics, of which *The Vote* derives in part from George Peele, and there are five tolerable but conventional poems of Samuel Pordage who is of particular interest to students of Dryden. The poems of John Norris are distinguished by a bluntness and a direct conversational quality which carry the reader's mind not only back to Donne but also forward to Browning:

No! I shan't envy him, who'er he be
 That stands upon the battlements of state;
 Stand there who will for me,
 I'd rather be secure than great.
 Of being so high the pleasure is but small
 But long the ruin, if I chance to fall.

William Latham's are among the best poems in the book, and it seems possible that Wordsworth had the lines here reprinted as *O Valente Huomo chi puo esser Misero* in mind when he wrote *The Character of a Happy Warrior*.

Thomas Master's *On Lutestrings Catt-Eaten* is a charming specimen of light verse, equalled by Leonard Willan's spirited rendering of the fable of *A Citie-Mous and Field-Mous* which draws its moral from the ethical superiority of country life to city life. In the light of Willan's statement, many other poems in this volume, Herrick's *Hesperides*, Habington's *Castara* and *The Queene of Arragon*, and a host of other works in verse and prose, an investigation into the moral implications of country life in the seventeenth century might be fruitful of results, and the lightness of tone attributed to Marvell's *The Garden* by Mr. A. H. King (vide *English Studies* XX. 5. June 1938, pp. 118-121) might be found to proceed from satirical intentions. Two memorial verses to Ben Jonson by Mildmay Fane and James Howell, and some complimentary lines to Richard Lovelace may be of interest to students.

It is a pity that Dr. Marshall did not think it worth while to set out the poets in chronological rather than in alphabetical order, and that he omitted an index of titles. Otherwise, his main fault as an editor is that of over-scrupulousness. Alphabetical presentation makes his index of authors supererogatory, and his glossary contains many unnecessary explanations that assume an extraordinary ignorance in his readers. For example: such words as 'cassia', 'cauls', 'dyll', 'germander', 'mace', 'marjorum', 'spicknard', 'sullibub', and 'zone', even with the original spelling, scarcely need elucidation, and any reader puzzled by 'Bajazet', 'Cimmerian', or 'Pharos' might better enlighten his ignorance by consulting the less rare poems of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

One is, nevertheless, grateful to Dr. Marshall for a fresh and illuminating piece of work, and can only hope that he will decide to publish further selections. If these included Collop's *Poesis rediviva* and Fletcher's *Poems on several Occasions* in toto it would be all to the good.

Groningen.

J. M. NOSWORTHY.

Lord Bolingbroke, Ses Ecrits Politiques. Par PAUL BARATIER. (Annales de l'Université de Lyon. Lettres, iii, 7.) 370 pp. Paris: Société d'Édition Les Belles Lettres. 1939.

Lettres Inédites de Bolingbroke à Lord Stair, 1716-1720. Par PAUL BARATIER. 106 pp. Imprimerie de Trévoux. 1939.

Though published separately these two books should be regarded as a single work, for the second and smaller one is actually a kind of appendix to the larger and main volume, and the two taken thus together give a fairly comprehensive picture of one side of Bolingbroke's literary activity. Whether, from the point of view of literary history, it is the most important side is open to question, but it was as a politician and as a writer on politics that Bolingbroke was best known in his own day, and it is in this double capacity that Dr Baratier sets out to study him. The writings upon which he draws are of two kinds: viz., published works on the one hand, and unpublished letters and manuscripts on the other. But Bolingbroke's political views and theories in themselves cover a wide field if treated in full, so very wisely the author has set limits to his inquiry. He has concerned himself only with domestic politics and constitutional theory, excluding everything on foreign policy or any other aspect of external affairs; and of course, religious and ethical doctrines do not come within his sphere. He has, too, made no attempt to trace out the sources of Bolingbroke's political ideas, save in a few cases where they are fairly obvious. This is not because it would not have been worth while to do so; on the contrary such a subject offers considerable scope for research to anyone in quest of a doctor's degree. But it is matter for a separate work, and it is well that it has been omitted from the present book.

Though Dr Baratier purports to be concerned mainly with Bolingbroke's political *writings*, he actually covers a much wider field, and deals, in fair detail, with the whole of his political career out of which those writings grew. The very arrangement of his work is evidence of this, for it falls into four main parts: the period as Secretary of State under Queen Anne, when Bolingbroke was one of the influences behind the Government; the period of disgrace and exile when, during his sojourn in France, he allied himself temporarily to the Pretender, but then deserted him and attempted to make his peace with the powers at home; the years after his return, when he became recognised as leader of the opposition to Walpole; and finally the period when he assumed the rôle of what the author terms "Mentor", or writer on political theory — actually an attempt to justify his own conduct.

As Dr Baratier reveals him Bolingbroke was first and foremost ambitious for power and position; he was not a party man in the strict sense of the word; he merely allied himself to a party in order to exploit it and climb to power. For parties as such he seems to have had something of contempt, but he knew when they were useful to him, as he knew when to throw

them over. He was, in short, an astute opportunist, not altogether free from Machiavellian principles. Such is the impression left by a reading of Dr Baratier's books. Under Anne his aim was to retain prestige and influence; in his period of exile his object was to regain it, even at the expense of changing sides; in opposition he was concerned to exert his own power and influence against that of the Walpole ministry.

The most important section of the book is the fourth of those mentioned above, entitled "Mentor", in which the author examines the main tenets of Bolingbroke's political doctrines (which do not always seem too logical and coherent.) No-one could call him a democrat, for he despised the popular voice; but he was a constitutionalist in the sense that he regarded the Constitution, not the King, as the keystone of the state. The King was the guardian of the Constitution, the servant of his people, the "supreme magistrate", and held a unique position on this account rather than in virtue of any Divine Right. That is the point of view advanced in *The Patriot King* and *A Dissertation on Parties*, the most important of Bolingbroke's political writings, and it probably represents his final position. But much as he despised the mere party man (a "bondslave" he called him in one of the letters to Lord Stair), he realised that parties were inevitable and perhaps had their uses; indeed, he seems to have been one of the first writers to stress the real function of an opposition; but it was for the King, and consequently for the ministers who served him, to stand above faction and unite all parties around the Constitution as symbolised in the monarch.

The letters to Lord Stair, printed from the originals in the possession of the present Lord Stair, at Lochinch Castle, Stranraer, constitute the principal documents for a study of Bolingbroke's period of exile. Lord Stair was British Ambassador in Paris, and as such he was charged by the home government with keeping Bolingbroke under surveillance now that he was in disgrace. In the circumstances, therefore, it seems strange that the two men should correspond on quite friendly terms, that the ambassador should on several occasions go out of his way to oblige the former Secretary of State, and that, if the inference from a single sentence in a letter dated January 19, 1718, to an unknown correspondent in England is correct ("the conveyance under Lord St. cover is perfectly safe"), he even allowed him to avail himself of the privileges of the diplomatic bag for his correspondence. All this, remarks Dr Baratier in a preface, illustrates the relative humanity of political disputes in the eighteenth century. That, of course, is one way of looking at it; but reading between the lines it might also appear that Stair was tactfully acting as mediator between Bolingbroke and the British Government, who realised that he might be a dangerous person in opposition and in close touch with the Jacobite agents. Bolingbroke's main concern was to obtain a pardon from the home government (it is the subject of a number of these letters); the Government's was to detach him definitely from the Jacobite cause and get him to lay information against several persons implicated in the Fifteen Rebellion. The former they

succeeded in doing, and there are frequent reiterations in the letters of his break with James and his followers; but the latter Bolingbroke refused to comply with as a matter of honour. What more likely than that Lord Stair was playing the part of negotiator? On reading these letters one does gain the impression that this might have been the position.

As we said before, the two books cannot well be detached one from the other. The letters are an appendix to the main study and the main study supplies the background and context for the letters. Taken thus together they constitute a valuable piece of research upon a figure of prime importance in the early eighteenth century.

Sheffield.

FREDERICK T. WOOD.

Poor Collins. His Life, his Art and his Influence. By E. G. AINSWORTH, Jr. xii & 340 pp. 8°. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press. London: Humphrey Milford. Oxford University Press. 1937. 15s. net.

Collins has been the centre of a growing body of discussion for some time now. Although he can hardly be regarded as one of the great figures of Eighteenth Century poetry — really great figures there were none, since Pope's genius never fully developed — yet his gifts were so mixed that the analysis of his poetic powers has more attraction for the present generation than a similar study of almost any of his contemporaries. As an artist he never reached the level of Gray, though we like to couple the two nowadays; his immediate influence on his own generation was practically negligible, though soon after his death recognition began to come slowly; yet in the promising quality of his immaturity, in the tendencies that underlie his inadequacies, there is a quality that attracts in increasing measure a critical attitude that is more and more willing to accept the will for the deed.

Prof. Ainsworth's contribution to this criticism is intentionally modest in its aim, being essentially a handbook for college students in need of a guide through Collins' poetry. He leaves the more constructive side of the task of presenting Collins the artist to Messrs McKillop, Garrod, etc. and confines himself to an exact philological rehearsal of minutiae. After a chapter on "Collins's Brief History", which contains all the facts known about Collins' career in the world, we get a series of chapters in which we are told what the poet's attitude towards nature was, how he saw mankind, what part contemporary events play in his work, what he thought about the arts in general and his poetic mission in particular and what the peculiar character of his allegorical impersonations meant. In these pages, which make up less than a quarter of the book, there is a wealth of fine observation and happy formulation which any student of Collins will thank-

fully accept. What is lacking is the background against which the poet stands, the atmosphere in which he and his art lived. It seems a pity that the mind that penetrated so justly into his poems should recoil from the larger task of presenting the whole "phenomenon" of Collins with all its implications.

For the rest of the book is hardly a compensation for what the first part lacks. It consists of two divisions; the first, on "Sources and Influences", traces the reflection of Collins' reading as found in his poems through the Classics, Milton, Dryden, Pope, the Elizabethans, his own contemporaries and the prose literature of history and travel he knew; the second follows the growth of his reputation among critics and poets in the decades after his death and down to the decease of the Romantic movement in the nineteenth century. Though the author fully realizes the perils of "source-hunting" and believes himself to be safe on the Road to Xanadu, yet he has fallen head and heels into the very slough of despond he wished to avoid. Page after page of minute parallels is offered to the reader, showing "poor Collins" dependent on his "sources" for practically every stitch of poetical clothing he ever had and with only an occasional soothing remark that it is not so bad as it looks to relieve the painful monotony. If the author had relegated the great mass of his finds to the appendix, where he places a detailed list of parallels with Milton, it would have improved his book immensely and incidentally have forced him to shift the accent from the negative impression that source-hunting always creates to the more positive aspect of the art with which Collins assimilated all this material into 'something new and strange'. As it is, the insistence on sources leads the author to parallels of a vagueness that adds nothing to the momentary force of his argument. Can Pope's lines from the *Dunciad* :

While through poetic scenes the genius roves,
Or wanders wild in academic groves,

have any real connection with Collins's verses in *The Manners* :

Farewell the Porch whose Roof is seen,
Arch'd with th'enlivening Olive's Green?

What has the sad note of "inevitability" in *Lycidas* :

Had ye bin there — for what could that have done?

really to do with Collins' words in the *Ode on the Popular Superstitions* :

What now remains but tears and hopeless sighs?

except the identity of thought, each appropriate in its place, but for different and self-sufficient reasons? And is it really thinkable that practically no poet of the later eighteenth century could express the mood of sadness at sundown we all are so familiar with without "borrowing" from Collins? In some places Mr. Ainsworth feels the weakness of his position and is careful to use expressions such as "seems", "suggests", "resemblances", etc. But that is hardly compatible with the exactness he

obviously aims at. At other times he inadvertently touches upon a problem that is inherent in the whole "influential" method. He speaks of the mixture of Miltonic phrases with words of Collins' own as a "practice" that Collins apparently "followed" in all of his extensive "borrowings" from his favorite poets, and says that "in many instances he used Milton's word without consciously associating it with a given passage in the poet's work". The question as to how far such parallels as those which fill the pages of Mr. Ainsworth's book are conscious borrowings or merely unconscious reminiscences is one of particular gravity in Collins' case in view of his youth and of his peculiar position as one of the founders of a new poetic style and a fuller discussion would have added to the value of the work. It would have clarified the author's conception of Collins' artistic aims, which is somewhat blurred by the contradiction of the statement on page 121 to the effect that Collins aspired "to write poetry in the best classical tradition" with that on page 123 which tells us that he had a desire "to mingle the classical and the romantic".

On the whole it is a thorough and generally reliable piece of work and its shortcomings are due to its method being pushed to an extreme. There is a great deal of valuable information about Collins contained in the book. But it places the *dissecta membra* rather than the living personality of its subject before the reader, reminding one of the verses in Goethe which will come more readily to one's mind than the name of the poet whom the author quotes on page 83, and one finally lays the book down with the feeling that the title is all-too appropriate.

Basel.

H. LÜDEKE.

Unforgotten Years. By LOGAN PEARSALL SMITH. 266 pp.
London: Constable and Company. 1938. 10s.

In the autobiography entitled *Unforgotten Years* the author of *Trivia*, one of the most charming and perfect prose-works ever written in the English language, tells the story of an interesting life. We read of his remarkable parents, who achieved fame as revivalists not only in America but even more in England and on the European Continent. Without rancour the author describes the queer educational methods of his saintly mother, who beat her baby son black and blue to save his soul. He relates, rather amusingly, his father's fall from grace owing to over-indulgence in 'loving-kindness' at revivalist meetings. He describes his father's first meeting with Walt Whitman, their growing friendship, and the delight with which the two new friends indulge in the study of 'buggy angles' (the angles of approximation between buggy-riding lovers). We follow the author in his literary awakening, his apprenticeship in his father's bottle factory, and his final escape to Europe where he dedicates himself to the study and

practice of prose-writing. Many famous figures are described in the book. There is a very amusing story about a meeting with Matthew Arnold at Dresden: "a tall figure in a suit of large checks, and with a broad face and black whiskers, marched in with the jaunty air of an English schoolmaster who, in travelling abroad, assumes what he considers a man-of-the-world deportment". (p. 120.) Whistler, Conder, Benjamin Jowett, Walter Pater, Edmund Gosse, Mrs. Edith Wharton and several other figures of note are among those described with the same sustained gentle irony and amusement. Readers familiar with other works by Logan Pearsall Smith will be interested in the passages describing his successes as a hunter of manuscripts; the discovery of many unpublished letters of Wotton's, of hundreds of letters by Madame du Deffand, of unknown Walpole and Carlyle correspondence, of unpublished poems by John Donne etc.. Most interesting of all, however, are the pages where this cultured literary epicurean discusses his beloved art, the art of prose-writing. He relates how he was inspired to try his hand at writing prose-poems by Baudelaire's remarks concerning this form of literature. (It is curious that it seems to have escaped the author that Baudelaire in his turn owed his opinions concerning the prose-poem to the author's fellow-countryman, Edgar Allan Poe.) The result of this inspiration was the little book entitled *Trivia*, afterwards followed by *More Trivia*. Several pages in *Unforgotten Years* (pp. 208-215) deal with the style and contents of *Trivia*. Together they form a very instructive and significant introduction, which may be strongly recommended to the unfortunate readers who have not yet discovered *Trivia*, or who having discovered these gems have failed to appreciate the unique perfection of 'the costly little book born in the solitude of the Sussex woods'. In the last chapter of *Unforgotten Years* the author expresses his opinions on the deficiencies of the literature of to-day. His remarks, tinged with the same friendly irony which permeates all the writings of this author, are very much to the point and make sad reading. Talking about the younger authors of the present day he writes: "My view is that they can't write at all. When they have scribbled down a page of newspaper English, they take no further trouble. Modern writing is mushroom writing; modern books are written for the day, and perish with it; and even while the day lasts how readily they drop from one's hands! The thought of purchasing such a book and keeping it to look at again occurs to no one, and who would dream of reading the best-seller of last year? The truth is that almost all that makes the reading of books delightful is neglected by those who wield their steel nibs in this age of steel." It is unnecessary to dwell upon the stylistic and literary qualities of *Unforgotten Years*. Its prose is flawless and smooth. A hurried or superficial reader may enjoy it without realising that only a lifetime of ceaseless study and practice can produce such rare perfection.

Brief Mention

Vendel i fynd och forskning. Skrift utgiven av Upplands Fornminnesförening. iv + 98 pp. and numerous plates. Uppsala, 1938. 3 Swed. crowns.

Ever since Knut Stjerna published his well-known articles the importance of the Swedish Vendel finds for Beowulf archaeology has been generally recognised. The publication here briefly noticed may therefore command the attention and interest of English scholars. The book is in Swedish, but there is a very full summary in English (20 pages to the 76 of the Swedish text, which includes numerous plates and reproductions), entitled *Vendel in Uppland and the Beowulf Poem*. In the volume are collected some very valuable essays, the longest and most important containing an account of the *Vendel Finds* by Holger Arbman. Others are Professor Sune Lindqvist's *On the Vendel Finds* (a general appreciation), *Ledung Chieftains in Boat Graves* by Oskar Lundberg, and *Villages and Hamnas in Vendel* by Manne Eriksson. A *hamna* was a unit in a division "on which the organisation of the sea-military was based". The English summary also contains a bibliographical chapter by Oskar Lundberg (not in the Swedish text, thus meant especially for Beowulf students). The fine reproductions of important finds in the Vendel graves give additional value to the volume, which is in reality a sort of Festschrift published on the occasion of the unveiling of the Vendel Monument erected on the graveyard in 1937. — E. E.

Seventh Supplement to a Manual of the Writings in Middle English 1050-1400. By JOHN EDWIN WELLS. New Haven, 1938. 7/—.

The Seventh Supplement, which covers the period June 1935—July 1938, fills almost exactly 100 pages (pp. 1550-1652) and is thus slightly shorter than the Sixth Supplement (cf. English Studies XVIII, p. 224). It brings the Bibliography up to date, and it need hardly be said that it is characterised by the same wonderful accuracy and completeness as its predecessors. English scholars owe a deep debt of gratitude to the indefatigable compiler.

The period 1935-1938 is hardly characterised by a great wealth of important new contributions in the field of Middle English literature, and the additions to no small degree consist in details concerning the location of MSS. and the like, for which purpose the *Census of Medieval and Renaissance MSS in the United States and Canada* by Seymour de Ricci and D. J. Wilson (1935-1937) has been largely drawn upon. Of important new editions may be mentioned *The Fillingham Firumbras and Otuel and Roland* (EETS 198), *A Short Metrical Chronicle* (EETS 196), Mlle d'Ardenne's *Seinte Iulienne* (Liège), and Wilson's *Sawles Warde* (Leeds Ser.). Hoïstrand's valuable study of *Seege of Troye* is duly reported on. Among contributions of a more general character that are extensively made use of we may mention Greene, *The Early English Carols* (Oxford, 1935), Oakden, *Alliterative Poetry in Middle English*, vol. 2 (Manchester, 1935), Wilson, *More Lost Literature* (Leeds Studies 5. 1, 6. 36), *Middle English Dialect Characteristics and Dialect Boundaries* (Essays & Studies, Univ. of Michigan, XIII, 1935).

It is very rarely that an inaccuracy or omission can be found in the book. It is hardly quite exact to say that the Harley MS. of *Seege of Troye* (p. 1564) was copied from a good original; it was founded on a good MS., but it is a remodelling rather than a copy. — The statement (p. 1606) that *Lyfe of Alisaunder* is in the Shropshire dialect is true only of the MS., which once belonged to Much Wenlock in Shropshire and may

have been written there. The original was doubtless in a different dialect. The MS. contains other romances as well. — *Firumbras* and *Otuel and Roland* was reviewed by the writer together with *A Short English Chronicle* and *Siege of Jerusalem* in *Engl. Studies* 19. — E. E.

Studien zur Englischen Literarkritik, 1910-30. Von H. W. HÄUSERMANN. (Kölner Anglistische Arbeiten. 34. Band.) VI + 244 pp. Bochum-Langendreer: Pöppinghaus. 1938. RM. 8,—.

No period of English Literature has been so prolific in its production of books and essays on the nature of poetry and literature in general, as the last fifty and especially the last thirty years. And since most of the aestheticians responsible for this output were and are poets themselves and since their theories are closely reflected in their poetry, it is practically impossible to penetrate their often 'obscure' poetry without acquainting oneself with the many apologiae written to justify new poetical experiments. In his *Studien zur Englischen Literarkritik* Prof. Häusermann has written an introduction to these writings, and it may be said at once that his study is extremely competent, sometimes even brilliant, and until a more extensive work be written in years to come, practically indispensable for a student of present-day poetry, the more so since many of the essays referred to are not readily accessible. The book contains a very valuable chapter on the periodicals representing different critical points of view, periodicals like *The Criterion*, *The London Mercury*, *The Chapbook*, *The Calendar* (all four deceased), *The (New) Adelphi*, *Scrutiny* etc. The author traces their evolution, and discusses their characteristics and their value. Apart from the immense work involved in the mere mastering of the extensive material, the author's detachment deserves our respect. For, though his own opinions are clearly to be found in the book, he does not allow them to interfere with the impartial valuation of the opinions of others. Not less valuable than the chapter on literary periodicals is his long chapter on I. A. Richards (two other chapters deal with Read and Graves). Not only does this chapter form a very able introduction to the psychological aesthetics of Richards, but it also may serve as a sound warning against overestimating the latter's work. Now that so many English critics seem inclined to consider Richards a kind of literary Messiah, it is refreshing to read Häusermann's analysis of his dogmas. The author rightly points out that the theories of Richards are essentially superficial. The chapters on the two other literary psychologists, Read and Graves, are equally illuminating. The bibliographical list at the end of the book should be of much use to any lover of literature who would like to make a closer study of the critics dealt with. But for the slightly stodgy Preface which might possibly prejudice a reader ignorant of the excellence to follow, this is a really admirable work. — D. G. v. d. V.

Das blaue Hotel. Von STEPHEN CRANE. 136 pp. 8°. Berlin n.d. (1937).

A small volume of six of Crane's short stories, containing, besides *The Blue Hotel*, *In the Life-boat*, *A Bride comes to Yellow Sky*, *The Clock Strikes Twelve*, *A Man — and Some Others* and *In Bondage*. It is the first German translation of any of Crane's work since the appearance of "Maggie, das Strassenkind. Autorisierte Uebersetzung von D. Landé. Leipzig. 1897". Except for *In the Lifeboat*, which is done by Hans Reisiger, the author of the superb translation of Walt Whitman, the German renderings

are by Hermann Stresau. Translating Crane is obviously not so easy as it looks, for though the present German text reads easily enough merely a short comparison with the original shows that Crane's peculiar flavor has not been captured. The sharp precision of his metaphorical language has been too often disregarded and the raciness of the dialogue can be matched in German only with difficulty. The general impression is one of a distinctly paler and feebler Crane, though Herr Reisiger's work is just as distinctly better than the rest. — H. L.

Bibliography

POETRY, FICTION, DRAMA

Mittelenglische Dichtungen aus der Handschrift 432 des Trinity College in Dublin. Herausgegeben von R. BROTANEK. iv + 218 pp. Halle/Saale: Max Niemeyer. 1940. R.M. 12.—. [A review will appear.]

Religious Lyrics of the XVth Century. Edited by CARLETON BROWN. xxxii + 394 pp. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. London: Milford. 1939. 10s. 6d. [A review will appear.]

Recusant Poets. By L. I. GUINEY. Sheed and Ward. 18s.

Poems and Dramas of Fulke Greville, First Lord Brooke. Edited with Introduction and Notes by GEOFFREY BULLOUGH. Vol. I: xi + 323 pp. Vol. II: 284 pp. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd. N.d. [1939.] 2 vols., 30 sh. net. [A review will appear.]

The Works of John Milton. Edited by FRANK ALLEN PATTERSON. 18 vols. in 21 books. New York: Columbia University Press. Library edition, \$ 105. Special edition, \$ 315.

Imitations of Horace. By ALEXANDER POPE. Edited by JOHN BUTT. Twickenham Edition, Volume IV. Methuen. 15s.

Rejoice in the Lamb. A Song from Bedlam. By CHRISTOPHER SMART. Edited by W. F. STEAD. Cape. 15s.

Les Prérromantiques Anglais. Choix de leurs Poèmes. Traduit, avec une introduction et des notices par ROGER MARTIN. (Collection Bilingue des Classiques Etrangers.) xviii + 350 pp. Paris: Aubier. 1939. 35 fr. [A review will appear.]

The Poetical Works of John Keats. Edited by H. W. GARROD. lxxxix + 572 pp. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. 1939. 30s. net.

Rossetti's "Sister Helen". Edited by J. C. TROXELL. viii + 95 pp. New Haven: Yale University Press. London: Milford. 1939. \$ 5.00; 22s. 6d. [A review will appear.]

Last Poems and Two Plays. By W. B. YEATS. Dublin: Cuala Press. 12s. 6d.

English Prose of the Romantic Period. Edited by C. F. MACINTYRE and M. EWING. Oxford: University Press. London: Milford. 10s.

The Complete Works of Lewis Carroll. Introduction by ALEXANDER WOOLLCOTT. Illustrations by JOHN TENNIEL. Nonesuch Press. 12s. 6d.

Finnegans Wake. By JAMES JOYCE. Faber & Faber. 25s.

Rabble in Arms. By KENNETH ROBERTS. Collins, 9s. 6d.

Derelicts. By WILLIAM MCFEE. Faber & Faber, 8s. 6d.

The Trouble with Tigers. By WILLIAM SAROYAN. Faber & Faber. 7s. 6d.

Judith Quinn. By CONAL O'RIARDAN. Arrowsmith. 8s. 6d.

The Best Short Stories. 1939. English and American. Edited by E. J. O'BRIEN. Cape. 7s. 6d.

King Lear 1608 (Pied Bull Quarto). *The Merchant of Venice* 1600 (Hayes Quarto). *The Merry Wives of Windsor* 1602. Shakespeare Association Facsimiles. The Shakespeare Association and Sidgwick and Jackson. 10s. 6d. each.

The New Shakespeare: King Richard II. Edited by J. DOVER WILSON. Cambridge University Press. 8s. 6d.

British Dramatists from Dryden to Sheridan. Edited by G. H. NETTLETON and A. E. CASE. Harrap. 15s.

What Say They? By JAMES BRIDIE. Constable. 2s. 6d.

HISTORY OF LITERATURE, CRITICISM

Introductions to English Literature. Edited by BONAMY DOBRÉE. Vol. I. The Beginnings of English Literature to Skelton, 1509. By W. L. RENWICK and HAROLD ORTON. Vol. V. The Present Age from 1914. By EDWIN MUIR. Cresset Press. 6s. each vol.

Early Middle English Literature. By R. M. WILSON. Methuen. 8s. 6d.

Die Wertwelt Chaucers, die Wertwelt einer Zeitwende. Von W. HÉRAUCOURT. (Kulturgeschichtliche Bibliothek, herausg. von K. Stegmann von Pritzwald.) xv + 403 pp. Heidelberg: Winter. 1939. Geh. RM. 15.—, geb. RM. 17.—. [A review will appear.]

John Skelton. A Sketch of his Life and Writings. By L. J. LLOYD. Oxford: Blackwell. 10s. 6d.

John Skelton. By W. NELSON. Columbia University Press. London: Milford. 15s. [A review will appear.]

Induction to Tragedy. A Study in a Development of Form in *Gorboduc*, *The Spanish Tragedy* and *Titus Andronicus*. By H. BAKER. 247 pp. Louisiana State University Press. 1939. \$2.75. [A review will appear.]

The Pastoral Elegy. An Anthology. Edited with Introduction, Commentary, and Notes by T. P. HARRISON, JR. English Translations by H. J. LEON. xi + 312 pp. Austin: The University of Texas. 1939. \$2.50. [A review will appear.]

Palladis Tamia (1598). By FRANCIS MERES. Introduction by DON CAMERON ALLEN. New York: Scholars' Facsimiles and Reprints. \$10.00.

Prolegomena for the Oxford Shakespeare. A Study in Method. By R. B. MCKERROW. xiv + 451 pp. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1939. 6s. [See Review, August 1939.]

Shakespeare's Life and Art. By P. ALEXANDER. Nisbet. 8s. 6d.

Shakespeare. By MARK VAN DOREN. 344 pp. New York: Henry Holt & Co. 1939. \$3.—.

Shakespeare in America. By E. C. DUNN. 310 pp. New York: The Macmillan Co. 1939. \$3.50.

Amazing Monument. A Short History of the Shakespeare Industry. By I. BROWN and G. FEARON. Heinemann. 10s. 6d.

Shakespeare: Persönliches aus Welt und Werk. Eine psychologische Studie. Von R. WOLLENBERG. (Abhandlungen zur Geschichte der Medizin und der Naturwissenschaften, Heft 31.) 139 pp. Berlin: Ebering. 1938. RM. 4.35.

Der dramatische Rhythmus in Shakespeares „Antony und Cleopatra“. Von R. BINDER. (Englandstudien, herausg. von C. A. Weber, Heft 1.) 173 pp. Würzburg: Konrad Triltsch Verlag. 1939. RM. 3.90. [A review will appear.]

Comical Satyre and Shakespeare's Troilus and Cressida. By O. J. CAMPBELL. San Marino: Henry E. Huntington Library. \$3.00.

- Die philosophisch-poetische Entwicklung George Chapmans.* Von N. VON POGRELL. (Britannica 18.) 171 pp. Hamburg: Friederichsen, de Gruyter & Co. 1939. RM. 7.50.
- The Pursuit of Poetry.* A Book of Letters about Poetry Written by English Poets, 1550-1930. Collected and edited by DESMOND FLOWER. Cassell. 10s. 6d.
- Studies in Seventeenth-Century Imagery.* Volume One. By MARIO PRAZ. 223 pp. London: The Warburg Institute. 1939. [See Review, Oct. 1939.]
- Le Chevalier Thomas Browne.* Par OLIVIER LEROY. Paris: Didier. Fr. 80.—.
- Thomas Fuller's The Holy State and the Profane State.* Edited by M. G. WALTON. Columbia University Press. London: Milford. Two Volumes. 35s.
- A Study in Milton's Christian Doctrine.* By A. SEWELL. Oxford: University Press. London: Milford. 7s. 6d.
- Milton on Himself.* Milton's Utterances Upon Himself and his Works. Edited by JOHN S. DIEKHOF. Oxford University Press. London: Milford. 15s.
- Studies in Literary Types in Seventeenth Century America (1607-1710).* In Two Parts. By J. K. PIERCY. xi + 358 pp. New Haven: Yale University Press. London: Milford. 1939. 16s. net. [See Brief Mention, Dec. 1939.]
- European Balladry.* By W. J. ENTWISTLE. Oxford University Press. 1939. 17s. 6d.
- The Life of Mrs. Godolphin.* By JOHN EVELYN. Edited by H. SAMPSON. Oxford University Press. 1939. 10s. 6d.
- English Scholars.* By D. C. DOUGLAS. 381 pp. London: Cape. 1939. 15s.
- Jonathan Swift, Dean and Pastor.* By R. W. JACKSON. Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. 1939. 6s.
- The Critical Works of John Dennis.* Edited by E. N. HOOKER. Vol. I. 1692-1711. xi + 537 pp. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press. 1939. \$5.—. [A review will appear.]
- Religious Trends in English Poetry.* By H. N. FAIRCHILD. Vol. I: 1700-1740. Columbia University Press. London: Milford. 25s.
- Joseph Ritson.* By B. H. BRONSON. University of California Press. London: Cambridge University Press. 34s. two volumes.
- The Life and Work of William Gilpin.* By W. D. TEMPLEMAN. (Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, vol. xxiv, nos. 3-4). 366 pp. Urbana, Illinois: The University of Illinois Press. 1939. Paper: \$3.00; cloth, \$3.50. [A review will appear.]
- Pride and Passion. Robert Burns 1759-1796.* By DELANCEY FERGUSON. Oxford University Press. London: Milford. 12s. 6d.
- Laurence Sterne en de Nederlandse schrijvers van c. 1780 — c. 1840.* Door F. L. W. M. BUISMAN-DE SAVORNIN LOHMAN. 130 pp. Wageningen: H. Veenman & Zonen. 1939. f 2.75.
Leiden diss.
- William Wordsworth of Rydal Mount.* By FREDERIKA BEATTY. Dent. 15s.
- Leslie Stephen and Matthew Arnold as Critics of Wordsworth.* By J. DOVER WILSON. 59 pp. Cambridge University Press. 1939. 2s. 6d.
- Wordsworth and Coleridge: Studies in Honor of GEORGE McLEAN HARPER.* Edited by EARL LESLIE GRIGGS. 354 pp. Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1939. \$4.
- The Road to Tryermaine.* A Study of the History, Background, and Purposes of Coleridge's "Christabel". By A. H. NETHERCOT. viii + 230 pp. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1939. \$3.00. [A review will appear.]
- Selected Writings of Thomas De Quincey.* Edited by PHILIP VAN DOREN. Nonesuch Press. 10s. 6d.
- Jane Austen and her Art.* By MARY LASCELLES. 238 pp. Oxford: Clarendon Press. London: Milford. 1939. 10s. 6d.

Keats. By H. W. GARROD. Second Edition. Oxford: Clarendon Press. London: Milford. 5s.

Studies in Keats, New and Old. Second Edition. By JOHN MIDDLETON MURRY. Milford. 8s. 6d.

Young Longfellow (1807-1843). By L. THOMPSON. Macmillan Co. 20s.

The Letters of Ralph Waldo Emerson. In Six Volumes. Edited by R. L. RUSK. Columbia University Press. London: Milford. £7. 7s.

Melville in the South Seas. By C. R. ANDERSON. Columbia University Press. London: Milford. 22s. 6d.

Walter Bagehot. By W. IRVINE. Longmans. 12s. 6d.

Die Auffassung von Liebe und Tod in Swinburnes Tristram of Lyonesse. Von A. M. MÜLLER. 89 pp. Würzburg: Konrad Triltsch. 1938.. [A review will appear.] Zürich diss.

Robert Louis Stevenson. By STEPHEN GWYNN. Macmillan. 6s.

The Irish Dramatic Movement. By U. ELLIS-FERMOR. Methuen. 10s. 6d.

Der Deutsche in der englischen Literatur vom Beginn der Romantik bis zum Ausbruch des Weltkrieges. Von F. SCHULTZ. (Studien zur engl. Philologie, herausg. von L. Morsbach & H.-O. Wilde, xcv.) 188 pp. Halle(Saale): Max Niemeyer. 1939. RM. 7.20. [A review will appear.]

Littérature Irlandaise Contemporaine. Par A. RIVOALLAN. ix + 202 pp. Paris: Hachette. 1939. Fr. 15.—.

American and British Literature Since 1890. By CARI VAN DOREN and MARK VAN DOREN. Revised Edition. Appleton-Century. 10s. 6d.

The History of the English Novel: Yesterday. By E. A. BAKER. Witherby. 16s.

Arnold Bennett. By G. LAFOURCADE. Muller. 12s. 6d.

Neil Munro und die nationale Kulturbewegung im modernen Schottland. Von H. WERNITZ. (Neue Deutsche Forschungen, Abt. Englische Philologie. Band 10.) 167 pp. Berlin: Junker und Dünhaupt. 1937. RM. 6.80. [A review will appear.]

The Burning Oracle. Studies in the Poetry of Action. By G. WILSON KNIGHT. Oxford: University Press. London: Milford. 12s. 6d.

Rehabilitations and other Essays. By C. S. LEWIS. Oxford University Press. London: Milford. 7s. 6d.

The Personal Heresy. By E. M. W. TILLYARD and C. S. LEWIS. London: Milford. 6s.

Essays and Addresses. By O. ELTON. Arnold. 7s. 6d.

I Knock at the Door. By SEAN O'CASEY. Macmillan. 10s. 6d. [Autobiography.]

One Way of Living. By JAMES BRIDIE. Constable. 8s. 6d. [Autobiography.]

Aristotelian Papers. Revised and Reprinted. By LANE COOPER. x + 237 pp. Cornell University Press. London: Milford. 1939. 14s. 6d. [A review will appear.]

The Concise Oxford Dictionary of English Literature. Oxford: Clarendon Press. London: Milford. 6s.

Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association. Vol. xxiv. 1938. Collected by LAURENCE BINYON. Oxford: Clarendon Press. London: Milford. 7s. 6d.

The Praetorian Cohorts

A Study of the Language of Francis Thompson's Poetry

I

G. K. Chesterton once said that perhaps the shortest definition of the Victorian Age was that Francis Thompson stood outside it.¹ His epigram would have gained in accuracy whatever it might have lost in point if it had read: "Perhaps the shortest definition of the Victorian Age in poetry is that Francis Thompson stood at the end of it."

Too much has been made of Thompson's supposed want of sympathy with his age. Too many writers have fallen into the misleading practice of stressing his kinship with the religious poets of the seventeenth century — misleading because it leaves wholly out of account an important aspect of his poetry; namely, his use of words. I need not cite examples of this well-nigh universal critical fallacy: it is too familiar. Paul Elmer More challenged this view, thirty years ago:

I cannot quite see that relationship. Something of Donne he may have, a little less of Herbert; of the free, more elastic singers of that religious age, Vaughan and Traherne and Marvell and Milton, in whom is all the exultant music of the dawn — scarcely a note ... his real affiliation is rather with the line of poets and visionaries of the nineteenth century who have combined a worship of heaven with subjection to the angel of the darker drink — Coleridge and De Quincey, Poe and Clarence Mangan, and, nearer his own age, the ill-starred James Thomson Still closer to him in point of time, are those finely wrought poets, Lionel Johnson and Ernest Dowson, who like him, looked to Rome for their faith.²

Certain close students of the literary currents of the nineties have been aware of Thompson's real relation to his period,³ but in the writings of the generality of superficial observers the fallacy persists that Thompson was fundamentally and completely out of tune with his age, and that his real affinity is with the devotional poets of the seventeenth century.

¹ *The Victorian Age in Literature* (New York, 1913), p. 203.

² *Shelburne Essays*, Seventh Series (Boston, 1910), pp. 165-166.

³ Osbert Burdett says of him, "With every allowance, he belongs to the group [the *fin de siècle* writers], perhaps because the visible movement was no more than an eddy on a wider current in which the Romantic impulse sighed itself out" (*The Beardsley Period* [London, 1925], p. 176). A. J. Farmer, speaking of the same group, says, "*Même ceux qui se tiennent délibérément à l'écart et qui condamnent sans ambages la 'décadence' en subissent souvent la contagion: la préciosité, la morbidesse visible dans la poésie de Francis Thompson, adversaire pourtant résolu, peuvent se ramener, dans une certaine mesure, aux raffinements mis à la mode par les décadents*" (*Le Mouvement esthétique et 'décadent' en Angleterre*, [Paris, 1931], p. 381). Holbrook Jackson, on the other hand, feels that Thompson cannot be "located" in the eighteen nineties, that "in his greatness he is of no time and all time"; and he goes on to refer with approval to the comparison with Vaughan, Herbert, and Crashaw made by "those who care to discover obvious resemblances among poets" (*The Eighteen Nineties* [London, 1922], pp. 201-202).

It is not my purpose here to speak of the more obvious respects in which Francis Thompson belongs to his age. I pass over the story of his unhappy life, a life which conformed so exactly to the legend established by the writers of what W. B. Yeats called "the tragic generation"; the strain of impotent self-pity — the final residue of a once proud and flaunting romanticism — that runs through his poetry; his Catholicism, which brings him into line with another symptomatic trend of the time. I would only call attention to Thompson's own acknowledgment of his subjection to the baneful spirit of the *fin de siècle* in "Moestitiae Encomium": "I know her [Sadness], for I am of the age, and the age is hers. Alas for the nineteenth century"⁴ I purpose in this essay, however, to deal with an aspect of Thompson's poetry which offers perhaps a more significant point of contact with his age. His characteristic practices in the use of words spring directly from the work of certain of his immediate predecessors and contemporaries, and mark him unmistakably as a poet of the late nineteenth century. It is, therefore, to a consideration of the language of Francis Thompson's poetry that this study is devoted.

II

In order properly to locate Francis Thompson in the stream of English poetry it will be necessary to glance briefly at the course which poetry ran in the nineteenth century with respect to language. I have made use in this connection of a theory outlined by Mr. F. W. Bateson in his book *Poetry and Language*⁵. He suggests that a history of poetry which is to be more than a series of critical essays, is only conceivable in terms of something essential to poetry. Poetry reduced to its simplest terms, he submits, is nothing more than a mode of expression, the media of which are words. His thesis, briefly stated, is this: that poetry develops *pari passu* with the words it uses, that its history is a part of the general history of language, and that its changes of style and mood are merely reflections of changing tendencies in the uses to which language is being put. Accordingly, he sketches a history of poetry in these terms from the time of Elizabeth to the present. For our purpose it will be necessary to go back only as far as the beginning of the nineteenth century.

The poets of the Romantic movement used words for their emotional connotations, as a reaction against the conception of language held by the poets of the preceding age. The rational spirit of the eighteenth century had led poets to use words in their precise denotations, and all the connotations had been allowed to dry up. The reaction to this manner

⁴ *Works of Francis Thompson* (London, 1913), III, 111. What could be more typical of the literary atmosphere of the nineties than this, from the same essay: "I have tasted the water of life ... and the taste was bitter as brine" (*ibid.*, p. 115)?

⁵ Oxford, 1934.

of using words reached its highest pitch in the poetry of Keats, in such lines as

Ææa's isle was wondering at the moon,

or

Those grim-rob'd senators of mighty woods,
Tall oaks, branch-charmed by the earnest stars,
Dream and so dream all night without a stir.

In time, this emotional use of words led the poets to neglect the meanings of words altogether, and to write purely in terms of their associations. This habit resulted inevitably, with the poets of the middle of the century, in diffuseness. As Mr. Bateson put it:

The diffuseness of Victorian English was ultimately derived from a loosening of the connexion between the connotations and the denotations of words. The two meanings had come ... to exist almost independently, with a mutual loss of vividness and precision. A word had its normal, its 'dictionary' meaning, and, side by side with that, a secondary meaning created by the contexts in which it was used. The difficulty therefore for the hearer or reader on each occasion was to be certain which meaning was intended — or rather, how much of each meaning, the proportion of primary and secondary meaning being constantly variable. And it was just the indecision in which this condition tended to terminate — in other words, the feeling of vagueness — that the Pre-Raphaelites exploited.⁶

In order to heighten this vague, romantic atmosphere, Rossetti and the Pre-Raphaelite poets went back to the Middle Ages for words which should have an aura of legendary association about them — a suggestion, perhaps, of "old, unhappy, far-off things." There came back into Victorian poetry a love of words for their own sake. Thus we find Rossetti writing, "I have been reading up all manner of old romaunts, to pitch upon stunning words for poetry."⁷ Pre-Raphaelite poetry is full of old words like *gonfalon*, *virelay*, *citole*, and the like.

No one [says Mr. Bateson,] would claim now that Rossetti's 'stunners' helped his poetry But the mistake was a fault on the right side in 1849. Rossetti's verbal excesses were tonic just because they were verbal. To the pundits who thundered — Matthew Arnold among them, — "Choose better subjects," Rossetti replied, "Choose better words."⁸

Pre-Raphaelitism ceased to be a positive force in English poetry after 1880, although Pre-Raphaelite poetry continued to be written in great quantities. A change had taken place in the language once more — a

⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 111.

⁷ W. M. Rossetti, ed., *Dante Gabriel Rossetti: His Family Letters* (London, 1898), p. 51. Cf. the youthful Tennyson who earlier (1831) had asked Hallam, then engaged in reading Blackstone, to keep an eye out for unusual or archaic words which might be suitable for poetry. See J. F. A. Pyre, *The Formation of Tennyson's Style* (Madison, Wis., 1921), Appendix A, p. 225. The entire appendix is illuminating in this connection. I am indebted for this reference to Professor Theodore Spencer.

⁸ *Op. cit.*, p. 109.

reaction towards greater precision in the use of words. The new conception of language brought with it a new poetry, the poetry, that is, that is being written today.

The old school of poetry died hard, however, and we shall witness its final convulsions in the work of Francis Thompson. The immediate effect of the new tendency in language on the poetry that was still being written in the old manner was to restrict its diction. The vagueness upon which it flourished, though it had left the living language, still adhered to the words and phrases that the earlier Romantic poets had consecrated. "A new kind of poetic diction now grew up," wrote Theodore Watts-Dunton, "a diction composed mainly of that of Shelley and Keats, of Tennyson, of Rossetti, of Swinburne, yet mixed with Elizabethan and more archaic forms"⁹ There were plenty of voices raised in protest, but the thing ran on until it finally lost itself in the sands of its own indefiniteness and diffuseness. Here is one of the protestants:

... poetic diction has latterly become a kaleidoscope, and one's chief curiosity is as to the precise combinations into which the pieces will be shifted. There is, in fact, a certain band of words, the Praetorian cohorts of poetry, whose prescriptive aid is invoked by every aspirant to the poetical purple, and without whose prescriptive aid none dares aspire to the poetical purple; against these it is time some banner should be raised. Perhaps it is almost impossible for a contemporary writer to evade the services of the free lances whom one encounters under so many standards. But it is at any rate curious to note that the literary revolution against the despotic diction of Pope seems issuing, like political revolutions, in a despotism of its own making.

The writer of these words, as it happens, was none other than Francis Thompson,¹⁰ but his critical theory apparently had no influence on his poetical practice, for his strictures are applicable in every respect to his own poetry, and, in point of fact, more apposite to his own poetry than to that of anyone else writing at the time.

Whether he was oblivious of the change which had taken place in the language, or whether, aware of the change, he was determined to fight it, he upheld the lost cause to the end, using consistently in his poetry the

⁹ *Poetry and the Renaissance of Wonder* (London, 1916), p. 296, quoted by Bateson. In a similar vein Alice Meynell wrote of what she called "pocket vocabularies": "Certain poets, a certain time ago, ransacked the language for words full of life and beauty, made a vocabulary out of them, and out of wantonness, wrote them to death. To change somewhat the simile, they scented out a word — an earlyish word, by preference, — ran it to earth, unearthed it, dug it out, and killed it. And then their followers bagged it. The very word that lives 'new every morning,' miraculously new, in the literature of a man of letters, they killed, and put into their bag. And, in like manner, the emotion that should have caused the word is dead for those, and for those only, who abuse its expression. For the maker of a portable vocabulary is not content to turn his words up there: he turns up his feelings also, alphabetically or otherwise" (*The Rhythm of Life and Other Essays* [London, 1897], pp. 41-42).

¹⁰ "Shelley," *Works*, III, 5-6. In a footnote to this passage he suggests that to prevent the deleterious effects of excessive reliance upon a "patrician clan" of poetic words a poet should constantly refresh and reinvigorate his vocabulary by contact with the language of prose, "the proletariat of speech" (*ibid.*).

over-descriptive, the vague, the 'poetic' word. At a time when Housman and Hardy were writing poetry all pith and concentration, Thompson was writing lines of more-than-Swinburnian mellifluousness like these:

As the cadent languor lingers after Music droops her fingers,
Beauty still falls dying, dying through the days.¹¹

Fighting, as it were, with his back against the wall, he saw the roster of words available for his type of poetry steadily diminishing, and (to keep up the metaphor) he was forced to summon to his aid all manner of reserves in the shape of super-annuated words, hastily naturalized foreign words, words which had been worn out in the service of several generations of romantic poets, vamped-up words of his own creation — in short, all the Praetorian cohorts of poetry which, in theory, he had denounced and disowned.

III

For convenience in discussing Thompson's use of words I have divided his unusual words into four classes. In the first class I group all the rare, archaic and obsolete words which he was at pains to resurrect; in the second class I put all the compound words which are so characteristic of his diction; under the third and fourth categories are subsumed his Latinisms and his coinages. I take it that these characteristics of Thompson's diction are sufficiently well known so that I need not illustrate them. A concordance of most of the unusual words in Thompson's poetry will be found in G. A. Beacock's study of the poet, and the reader is referred to that work for a detailed analysis of Thompson's vocabulary.¹²

It is the usual custom in writing about Thompson to trace in his poems the influence of the Elizabethans, the metaphysical poets, or the poets of the Romantic Revival. It is all very well to point out that Drayton uses the word *shawm*, that Spenser uses *levin* and *emprise*, that Donne has *devirginate*, and that Shelley was Thompson's authority for *blosmy*. But it is much more important to discover where Thompson got the conception of poetic diction which led him to use these and similar words. And for this it is natural to look in the theory and practice of writers nearer his own time. For this reason I have chosen to consider the influence of Rossetti, of Coventry Patmore, and of Alice Meynell. It is here, I believe, and not in the poets of more remote times, that we shall discover the origins of Thompson's peculiar vocabulary.

¹¹ "The Sere of the Leaf," ll. 49-50.

¹² *Francis Thompson: Versuch Einer Literarischen und Metrischen Würdigung Seiner Poetischen Werke* (Marburg 1912). On pp. 79-83 will be found separate lists of the rare, archaic, and obsolete words used by Thompson, which I have included in one classification. On pp. 60-68 there is a list and an analysis of his compound expressions; and on pp. 83-86 a list of words which appear only in Thompson's poetry, including many of his coined Latinisms.

Rossetti was Thompson's first master. An early poem of Thompson's, written on the anniversary of Rossetti's death, starts with these lines:

He taught our English art to burn
With colours from diviner skies¹³

One suspects that the "colours from diviner skies" were in reality colours drawn from Rossetti's reading in medieval literature. There is no overlooking, however, the depth of Thompson's admiration. His early poems are permeated with the spirit of Rossetti. In one of the very first of his poems to be published, we find these lines:

And souls went palely up the sky,
And mine to Lucidé.¹⁴

Does not this recall Rossetti in "The Blessed Damozel"?

And the souls mounting up to God
Went by her like thin flames.

If one desires further evidence that he was under the influence of Rossetti at the time of the writing of this lyric, one need only look at these lines:

Her eyes were clear, her eyes were Hope's,
Wherein did ever come and go
The sparkle of the fountain drops
From her sweet soul below.¹⁵

and recall that it was at this time that he wrote, and submitted to *Merry England* in the same envelope with this poem, the essay called "Paganism Old and New," in which we find this passage:

But the most surprising indication of this blindness to the subtler qualities of beauty is the indifference of the ancient singers to what in our estimation is the most lovely and important feature in woman — the eye The value which ... Rossetti had for this feature in feminine attraction is conspicuous. Witness his Blessed Damozel, whose

Eyes were deeper than the depth
Of waters stilled at even.¹⁶

The poem "To My Godchild" definitely bears the impress of Pre-Raphaelite notions in its naive detailing of the heavenly landscape. For example:

¹³ Everard Meynell, *The Life of Francis Thompson* (New York, 1926), p. 119.

¹⁴ "Dream Tryst," ll. 7-8.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, ll. 13-16.

¹⁶ Thompson, *Works*, III, 44-45.

Pass by where wait, young poet-wayfarer,
 Your cousined clusters, emulous to share
 With you the roseal lightnings burning 'mid their hair;
 Pass the crystalline sea, the Lampads seven: —
 Look for me in the nurseries of heaven.¹⁷

None of the critics seems to have noticed that "The Making of Viola" and "A Judgment in Heaven" are typical Pre-Raphaelite poems, though it must become apparent to anyone who takes the trouble to read them. One writer appears to have had some appreciation of the character of "The Making of Viola" when he wrote, "The words seem to flutter like the angels of Fra Angelico's pictures,"¹⁸ but he did not extend his line of thought far enough to grasp the real source of the poem. Thompson himself wrote of these two poems, "the spirit of such poems as "The Making of Viola" and "A Judgment in Heaven" is no mere medieval imitation, but the natural temper of my Catholic training in a simple provincial home."¹⁹ Here Thompson lays his finger on the principal difference between Rossetti and himself. Rossetti's Catholicism was a garment put on for the purpose of giving an atmosphere to his poetry and his painting, whereas Thompson's Catholicism was bred in the bone. Rossetti contrived to assimilate the aesthetic possibilities of Catholic ritual and legend without being affected by the faith. Whatever one's opinion of Thompson as a poet, one cannot impugn the sincerity of his religion.

I have written thus at length upon the influence of Rossetti on Thompson's writing because it seems to me that it has not been sufficiently stressed by students of Thompson. In general, as I have stated, the critics have sought in more remote periods of English letters for Thompson's masters, whereas a properly adjusted perspective will reveal them to have been the poets who immediately preceded him in his own century.

What are the characteristics of Rossetti's diction which might have provided Thompson with materials for his own style? In his early poems particularly, Rossetti used many archaic words, culled from old ballads and romances, for their decorative value — words like *galiot*, *stound*, *chevesayle*, and the like. With this went a certain simplicity and directness of phrase, and a tendency to use monosyllabic and Anglo-Saxon words. In *The House of Life*, however, the simplicity of language disappeared, and we find him using many compound expressions like *winter-bitten*, *angel-greeted*, *fire-fledged*, *dawn-pulse*. Here, as in his love for old words, the influence of Keats is clearly visible. Coupled with this is a tendency to use, whenever possible, sonorous expressions of Latin origin, as, for example,

¹⁷ "To My Godchild," ll. 63-67. The poet's biographer finds in this poem instances of "close borrowing from Coleridge", (Meynell, *Life*, 119), but in the passage which he quotes from Coleridge for comparison I see no similarity beyond the mere use of the words "the Lampads seven."

¹⁸ Theodore Maynard, quoted in Connolly's edition of Thompson's poems (New York, 1932), p. 309.

¹⁹ Meynell, *Life*, p. 47.

*multiform circumfluence manifold, or incarnate flower of culminating day; and a propensity for coining words like garmented, queendom, immemorable.*²⁰

Here are all the elements which I have singled out as characteristic of the peculiar vocabulary which we associate with Francis Thompson — the archaisms, the compounds, the Latinisms, and the coined words. I do not mean to suggest that Thompson deliberately imitated Rossetti in his use of words; I merely wish to submit that Rossetti's theory of a language suitable for poetry lay ready at hand, and that it would have been entirely natural for Thompson to have adopted it for his own. He was forced by the peculiar circumstances of his situation at the end of the tradition of nineteenth-century poetry to push this theory of language to extremes which Rossetti never envisaged, but the conclusion that he had some such theory is inescapable in view of the singular poetical jargon in which he chose to do the greater part of his writing.

Thompson became intimate with Coventry Patmore during his stay at the Franciscan monastery at Pantasaph between 1892 and 1896. He dedicated his *New Poems* to him, and many tributes to Patmore as a poet can be found scattered through his works. More significant, however, than any express acknowledgment of his debt to Patmore, are the permanent traces of Patmore's ideas on the form of Thompson's poetry. Thompson himself, in a letter to Patmore, said of "Orient Ode," "It echoes your manner largely in the metre and even in some of the diction — the latter a thing of which, I think, I have seldom before rendered myself guilty."²¹ The metrical form of most of Thompson's later odes was "based on the principles which Mr. Patmore may be said to have discovered."²²

It is with the impact of Patmore's diction on Thompson's poetry that we are concerned. Thompson, as we have seen, frankly acknowledged his debt to Patmore in this particular. Patmore's own opinion of Thompson's diction, therefore, will be of interest. In an article contributed to the *Fortnightly Review* in 1894, he wrote:

It is wonderful that with such a truly splendid command of language as is possessed by this poet, he should have thought it expedient to search the dictionary for words many of which are not only archaic, but really extinct and incapable of resurrection. It is no excuse for the use of such a word as "cockshut-light" that it has been once or twice used by Marlowe or somebody, for "twilight," and there is still less excuse for Mr. Thompson's abundant invention of entirely new words, which have not even the plea of being beautiful, but only that of being etymologically intelligible to those who know Latin. Only the very greatest poets have ever, so far as I recollect, succeeded in adding more than two or three new words to the language of English poetry; but Mr. Thompson's muse hatches them by the dozen, with the effect, in each case, of producing a shock of interruption which spoils what might otherwise have been a delicate flow of thought and rhythm.²³

²⁰ In this brief analysis of Rossetti's use of words, I have followed [^] C. Benson, *Rossetti* (London, 1916), p. 85.

²¹ Meynell, *Life*, p. 144.

²² *Ibid.*, p. 132. The chief of these principles was that the length of lines should be determined by the sense and emotional content.

²³ *Courage in Politics and Other Essays* (London, 1921), pp. 161-162.

Anyone who is familiar with Patmore's diction will realize that, like Thompson, he disregarded in practice what he preached in his capacity as critic. This dualism is interesting for it suggests that these poets were aware of the reactionary nature of their poetry, and sought to cover it up by advocating more progressive principles in their criticism. At any rate, one finds in Patmore, especially in the loose, irregular odes of *The Unknown Eros*, archaic words like *corse*, *shaw*, *fardel*,²⁴ compounds like *prepanse-occulted*, *vestal-February*, *course-compelling*, *love-foreboding*, Latinisms like *transpicious words*, *lazuline delight*, *omniloquent tongues*, and nonce-words like *praeternuptial*, *praeernal*, *injucundity* and *disem-paradised*. Here, then, in the works of a poet whom Thompson knew and revered, was ample precedent for the Thompsonian diction.

The story of how Alice Meynell and her husband rescued Thompson from the streets of London and adopted him into their own home is well enough known; his affection, verging on adoration, for Mrs. Meynell forms the substance of many of his poems. What has been overlooked, however is the influence which Alice Meynell exerted on the development of Thompson's style. She was not in sympathy with the backward-looking tendencies which she observed in much of the poetry of her day. In her criticism (a sample of which has been given above) she was a positive force on the side of the new tendencies in language, and in her poetry she assiduously avoided the use of second-hand "poetic" words. But at the same time, she did advocate the use of words of Latin origin. Latin to her was the language *par excellence* of "composure," and she prescribed the use of a Latinate style as a sort of sedative for the nervous ills of a headlong machine civilization. The choice being open to a writer of English between the use of Teutonisms and Latinisms, she wrote, "the perturbations of the pulses and impulses of so many hearts quickened in thought and feeling in this day suggests to me a deliberate return to the recollectedness of the more tranquil language."²⁵ She admired in Shakspeare such phrases as *superfluous kings* and *multitudinous seas*.²⁶ It is well, she thought, "that we should not resist the rhythmic reaction bearing us now somewhat to the side of Latin. Such a reaction is, in some sort, an ethical need for our day. We want to quell the exaggerated decision of monosyllables. We want the poise and the pause that imply vitality at times better than headstrong movement expresses it."²⁷

²⁴ It was Patmore's opinion that "the three chief fountains of wonderful diction" were Spenser, Shakspeare, and Milton. "What a mine he is of words!" he once said of Spenser. See Thompson's essay on Milton (*Works*, III, 200).

²⁵ *The Rhythm of Life and Other Essays* (London, 1897), pp. 56-57.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 58. Thompson too was pleased by "the successful and wonderful latinisms of Shakespeare." But it is Milton, he says, "who has been the great lapidary of Latin splendours in the English tongue, solemnities of diction, indeed, so exotic that for the most part they remain among the unprofaned insignia of poetry when she goes forth in state, words never journalized by the 'base, mechanical hand' of prose" ("Milton", *Works*, III, 201). In this passage Thompson openly professes his faith in a certain body of words which he considers proper to poetry alone.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 58-59.

Accordingly, she encouraged Thompson in the use of Latinisms, and defended him publicly against those who objected to his diction on this score.²⁸ She also, no doubt, encouraged him in the practice of coining new words from Latin or Old English roots and particles, for she wrote, in "Anima Pellegrina," "Do we possess anything more essentially ours ... than our particle 'un'? Poor are those living languages that have not our use of so rich a negative."²⁹ According to Beacock's concordance there are in Thompson forty-two adjectives formed by the addition of this particle. It seems highly probable that his proclivity for manufacturing such words is traceable in part, at least, to Mrs. Meynell.

These were the influences which combined to shape Thompson's vocabulary. We may turn our attention now to the result in an attempt to discover whether there is any significant evolution discernible in his conception of language over the period of approximately fifteen years during which he was writing poetry, and finally, to evaluate his poetical production as a whole in terms of his use of words.

IV

If one looks at the "Ode to the Setting Sun," his earliest long poem (printed in *Merry England* in 1889), one finds all the characteristics of his diction already fully developed. There are no less than nineteen rare or archaic words in the poem, ten words of Thompson's own coinage, many compounds like *believing-passionate*, *Medusa-pleasure*, *death-neighboring*, and a high percentage of long words of Latin origin. If one turns to one of his latest poems — an ode written on the death of Cecil Rhodes in 1902 — one finds him still using many double-barreled words — *lion-'larumed*, *many-linguaged*, *long-ungazed-at*, *Dutch-stubborned*; one still finds nonce-words like *centuried*, and *visioner*; one still finds the Latinisms — *large compacting hand*, *the iniquitous years*, *the aspirant soul*. One misses only the archaic words, and in fact, the only statement that one can safely make about the evolution of Thompson's style, so far as words are concerned, is that in his very latest poems there is a slight drop in the number of old words used. This may have been due to the salutary influence of Mrs. Meynell. Mr. Mégroz, however, goes too far when he says:

... the more mature artist is much less revolutionary in his regard for words. Making a long list of peculiar words as I read through the verse from the beginning of Volume I to the end of Volume II, I found the numerical proportion of the words noted in the first volume to those noted in the second was as 5:2, while nearly all the words most

²⁸ "Obviously there are Latinisms and Latinisms!" she wrote. "Those of Gibbon and Johnson, and of their time generally, serve to hold passion well at arm's length; they are the mediate and not the immediate utterance of human feeling. But in Francis Thompson the majestic Latin word is forged hot on the anvil of the artificer" (Everard Meynell, *Life of Francis Thompson*, p. 114).

²⁹ *Ceres's Runaway and Other Essays* (London, 1909), p. 49.

difficult to justify among these unusual or unusually employed words were in the first volume.³⁰

Thompson himself thought that he had gained in chastity of style, for he wrote in a note intended to accompany *New Poems*, but later cancelled, "Of words I have coined or revived I have judged fit to retain but few; and not more than two or three will be found in this book."³¹ I do not know upon what principles Mr. Mégroz compiled his list of peculiar words, nor do I know what method of counting Thompson used; but by referring to Beacock's lists I find that of the 183 rare, archaic, and obsolete words found in Thompson's works as a whole, 88 appear in *New Poems*. I find also that of the 134 words coined by Thompson, 76 are to be found in *New Poems*. These figures seem to me indicate clearly that Thompson had by no means withdrawn his allegiance from the cohorts of poetic words when he published *New Poems* in 1897. The falling-off, which I have mentioned, in the number of archaic expressions is discernible only in the poems written after 1897, although he seems to have been making some partial reforms in that direction before that date. In revising the early "Ode to the Setting Sun"³² he deleted in a few cases the archaic word in favor of the more normal form. For example, *vail* was changed to *veil*, *uprist* to *uprisen*. He also modified some passages which in Wilfrid Meynell's opinion had been disfigured by "violence of diction."³³ "Thy visioned music-blasts" was altered to "thy visible music-blasts," and "Had quaked Olympus and beshuddered men," was revised to read "Had quaked Olympus and cold-fearing men." These revisions, however, did not materially alter the character of the style; in his affection for unusual words he remained, to the end, unregenerate.

Nevertheless it may be said that although Thompson affected a special vocabulary for poetry throughout his career, his last poems show that he had begun to assimilate the strange words into a more homogeneous style in which individual words ceased to protrude themselves like excrescences out of their contexts. This may indicate the approach of a long-deferred poetic maturity.

V

Whatever else may be said, there is no denying that Thompson achieved a distinctive style in poetry. Though the means may seem to us illegitimate, we must still allow that the result is a style of unmistakable individuality. With only a few minor exceptions³⁴ he was consistent

³⁰ R. L. Mégroz, *Francis Thompson: the Poet of Earth in Heaven* (London, 1927), pp. 61-62.

³¹ Meynell, *Life*, p. 115.

³² Some of the variant readings are given by Beacock in an appendix (*op. cit.*, pp. 116 ff).

³³ Meynell, *Life*, p. 96.

³⁴ There are a few poems — among them "Daisy," "Little Jesus," and "Messages" — in which he made a conscious attempt to write simply in order to produce an effect of *naïveté*. These few poems, however, are entirely uncharacteristic.

in the use of his personal poetic vocabulary so that one must recognize his accents at once. At his best he secures a luxuriance and a richness of texture like that of some opulent old tapestry; at his worst he staggers and all but falls under the sheer weight and clumsiness of his language.

"The Hound of Heaven" probably remains his most successful poem. All the peculiar characteristics of his diction which we have noted are abundantly present, but for once the poetic impulse seems to have been strong enough to enable him to rise above the self-imposed trammels of language which, in the majority of instances, tended to keep him fast to the ground. In fact, the sudden contrasts in verbal movement which make the poem such an amazing metrical *tour de force* depend in no slight degree on the special nature of the words used — the ponderous deliberateness of the Latinisms, and the rapidity and frequent cacophony of the archaisms and coinages.

His use of Latinisms often led him into flagrant excesses, as, for instance, in this line :

Sublimed the illuminous and volute redundancy,³⁵

or in the following passage :

Some with languors of waved arms,
Fluctuous oared their flexile way;
Some were borne half resupine
On the aerial hyaline.³⁶

When, on the contrary, he reined in his Latinisms, he could write such impressive lines as these :

As the innocent moon that nothing does but shine,
Moves all the labouring surges of the world.³⁷

There are a few passages of sombre eloquence in Thompson which sometimes appear almost to justify his choice of language — passages which recall the magnificent mortuary rhetoric of the early seventeenth-century dramatists, or of Sir Thomas Browne. Here, for example, is a passage from "An Anthem of Earth":

What is this Man, thy darling kissed and cuffed,
Thou lustingly engender'st,
To sweat, and make his brag, and rot,
Crowned with all honour and all shameful? —
From nightly towers
He dogs the secret footsteps of the heavens,
Sifts in his hands the stars, weighs them as gold-dust,

³⁵ "Sister Songs," Part I, l. 233.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, ll. 130-134.

³⁷ "Sister Songs," Part II, ll. 261-262.

And yet is he successive unto nothing
 But patrimony of a little mold,
 And entail of four planks³⁸

There are passages in the mystical poems which were printed in the volume of 1897, in the section called "Sight and Insight," which recall the power, though not the manner, of the metaphysical poets. The opening lines of "Contemplation" (which is certainly one of Thompson's best poems) are not far inferior to the best of Vaughan.

This morning saw I, fled the shower,
 The earth reclining in a lull of power :
 The heavens, pursuing not their path,
 Lay stretched out naked after bath,
 Or so it seemed ; field, water, tree, were still,
 Nor was there any purpose on the calm-browed hill.

The hill, which sometimes visibly is
 Wrought with unresting energies,
 Looked idly ; from the musing wood,
 And every rock, a life renewed
 Exhaled like an unconscious thought
 When poets, dreaming unperplexed,
 Dream that they dream of nought.
 Nature one hour appears a thing unsexed,
 Or to such serene balance brought
 That her twin natures cease their sweet alarms,
 And sleep in one another's arms.
 The sun with resting pulses seems to brood,
 And slacken its command upon my unurged blood.³⁹

In the same section of *New Poems*, nevertheless, there are lines like

Who in most dusk and vidual curch,⁴⁰

which are well-nigh unintelligible without the aid of a dictionary. The line makes perfect sense when one realizes that *vidual* is derived from the Latin *vidua*, and that *curch* is an archaic term for a head-covering worn by women.⁴¹ But why did Thompson choose to use such words as these

³⁸ Ll. 101-110.

³⁹ Ll. 1-19.

⁴⁰ "Orient Ode," l. 175.

⁴¹ The principal objection to Thompson's use of words is not, I think, that it causes obscurity, for a little application will generally make the sense of his knottiest passages clear. Thompson's most recent editor has some difficulty with the word *unbannering* in the following passage from one of Thompson's translations from Hugo :

Now the magnificent Ocean, as I said, unbannering

A voice of joy, a voice of peace, did never stint to sing.

He objects that there is no such word in English, since in the context it clearly cannot be a negatived form of the verb *to banner* which means (1) to furnish with a banner, or (2) to raise a banner (against) (T. L. Connolly, ed., *Poems of Francis Thompson*, pp. 392-393). In view of the fact that Hugo's word which Thompson is here translating, is *épandait*, it seems obvious that *unbannering* means "unfurling as a banner."

in preference to the more normal words? Why did he choose, in "A Fallen Yew," to write

But now our yew is strook ...⁴²

when *struck* would have served just as well? The following passage from a letter of Thompson's is revealing in this connection:

By the way, I see Blackburn has queried 'lovesome.' Is there no such word? I never made a doubt that there was. It is at any rate according to analogy. If it is in error, then 'lovely' must be substituted throughout, which differs somewhat in *nuance* of meaning.⁴³

So far as the basic meanings of the two words are concerned there is actually no difference: the New English Dictionary gives "lovable by reason of beauty" for both *lovely* and *lovesome*. The special *nuance* of meaning which Thompson felt in *lovesome* results from its having been, for more than a century, a word whose use had been restricted to poetry, so that its associations differ from those of *lovely*, which is common to both poetry and prose. In virtually every case where there was such a choice, Thompson preferred the more "poetic" word, the more emotional word, the word furthest removed from prose associations.⁴⁴

⁴² L. 22.

⁴³ *Life*, p. 111.

⁴⁴ It is worth while here to notice an instance of the misleading kind of criticism, referred to in the second paragraph of this essay, which attempts to establish a relationship between the kind of poetry which Thompson wrote and that of the metaphysical poets. According to K. Rooker, Thompson resembles the poets of the seventeenth century in his fondness for rich, musical phraseology. This partiality for "*les belles phrases*" he manifests "*de même façon qu'eux, à savoir par des périodes longues et sonores de construction un peu trop compliquée parfois et d'une sonorité un peu lourde, mais magnifiques quand même; par l'emploi de mots rares et peu usités, quelquefois forgés par lui ou tirés de la langue technique et d'habitude réservés à la prose ...* [My emphasis]" (*Francis Thompson* [Bruges, 1912], pp. 148-149).

Insofar as this is an accurate description of Thompson's style, it is susceptible of an interpretation other than the one which Rooker appears to give it. When the metaphysical poets use technical words their object is greater precision of meaning; they use the scientific term because no less exact word will satisfy the rigorously intellectual demands which they make upon the language. Thompson's occasional choice of a technical term, on the other hand, is part of his quest for the unusual, the bizarre word. His choice is prompted not by a concern for the precise denotations of words but by his desire to exploit the sudden, startling effect which the word will have on the reader.

The diction of the metaphysical poets is, on the whole, remarkably simple and pure. One has only to think of

I saw eternity the other night

or

I have a sin of fear that when I have spun
My last thread, I shall perish on the shore

to realize that in their conception of language the metaphysical poets were at the opposite pole from Thompson. The difference may be briefly stated as the difference between the intellectual and the emotional use of words. As Sir Herbert Grierson puts it: "The

The inevitable consequence of this constant practice is that his poetry lacks immediacy and definition. In his descriptive passages he is diffuse and vague. This passage from "Sister Songs" will illustrate the indefinite and indistinct quality which infects all his descriptions:

In the new-sucked milk of the sun's bosom
Is dabbled the mouth of the daisy-blossom;
The smouldering rosebud chars through its sheath;
The lily stirs her snowy limbs,
Ere she swims
Naked up through her cloven green,
Like the wave-born Lady of Love Hellene;
And the scattered snowdrop exquisite
Twinkless and gleams,
As if the showers of the sunny beams
Were splashed from the earth in drops of light.⁴⁵

I venture to single out these lines as an illustration in the teeth of one of Thompson's apologists who says, "It is a shallow criticism which can only see vagueness in such imagery; the poet has removed himself farther from the object because he is less concerned to describe than to use it in expressing a spiritual state."⁴⁶ I submit that Thompson inevitably removes himself from the object by choosing to use vague and second-hand language. To say that "the poet has removed himself farther from the object because he is less concerned to describe than to use it in expressing a spiritual state," seems to me to be making the best of a regrettable inadequacy with respect to language on the part of the poet.⁴⁷

One cannot read "The Hound of Heaven," "Contemplation," "The Dread of Height," or "The Kingdom of God," without feeling that, writing under different conditions, Thompson might have been a genuinely great religious poet — the peer of Crashaw. But he was hampered in his mystical flights by a vocabulary inherited from the poets who had preceded him. He never succeeded in freeing himself from these impedimenta, and only occasionally was the poetical impulse powerful enough to enable him to rise in spite of them.

With Thompson, then, the tradition of poetry and, more especially, of the language of poetry, whose advent had been signalized in 1798 comes

metaphysicals are the masters of the 'neutral style,' of a diction equally appropriate, according as it may be used, to prose and verse" (*Metaphysical Lyrics and Poems of the Seventeenth Century* [Oxford, 1925], p. xxxi). Thompson, on the other hand, is seeking to create a special language for poetry, a language as remote as possible from everyday speech; and he is sometimes led to draw his materials from the technical vocabularies customarily confined to prose, in pursuance of this end.

⁴⁵ "Sister Songs," Part I, ll. 13-23.

⁴⁶ R. L. M  groz, *Francis Thompson*, p. 181.

⁴⁷ Another statement of Mr. M  groz's which hardly needs controverting in view of the course which English poetry has run since the beginning of the twentieth century, is that in which he says, speaking of Thompson, "It is safe to say that no English poet since Wordsworth has had a more influential and energy-releasing effect on poetic diction" (*op. cit.*, p. 62).

to an abrupt halt in a blind alley. For this reason, perhaps the best definition of Francis Thompson is simply that he stood at the end of the nineteenth century. And conversely, as I suggested at the beginning, perhaps the shortest definition of the Victorian Age in poetry is that Francis Thompson stood at the end of it.

Cambridge, Mass.

FREDERICK B. TOLLES.

Notes and News

Grendel's Abode: An Illustrative Note

Those passages in *Beowulf* which describe the mysterious lake wherein Grendel and his mother lived are justly celebrated, even though careful analysis fails to discern an exactness of pictorial detail.¹ The actual setting of the so-called 'waterfall-cave' wherein Beowulf fought is well known from several interesting parallel scenes (particularly from the Norse sagas) as an essential feature of the original story. The same cannot be said of the incidental descriptions given in the poem (ll. 1357 ff., 1408 ff.) of the surrounding countryside.

Yet these are not less interesting; and of special interest is the fact, in Klaeber's words,² that

manifestly conceptions of the Christian hell have entered into the picture as drawn by the poet. The moors and wastes, mists and darkness, the cliffs, the bottomless deep, the loathsome *wyrmas* can all be traced in early accounts of hell, including Ags. literature. Especially close is the relation between this Beowulfian scenery and that described in the last portion of the 17th *Blickling Homily* which is based on a *Visio Pauli* ... It is hardly going too far to attribute the remarkable agreement to the use of the same or a very similar source.

These particular parallelisms have long been known, and they appear sufficiently close to justify this conclusion of Klaeber's. That current eschatologic conceptions had a primary influence on the Beowulfian scene is hardly open to doubt. But in order to determine the precise influence it would be well to collect similar medieval analogues. A stray one may be noted here in illustration.

This is the description of the land of purgatorial torment in an important eschatologic document, the *Fis Adamnáin*, a vision attributed to St. Adam-

¹ Cf. William W. Lawrence, "The Haunted Mere in Beowulf," *PMLA*. xxvii (1912), 208 ff.; James R. Hulbert, "A Note on the Psychology of the Beowulf Poet," *Studies in English Philology, a Miscellany in Honor of Frederick Klaeber*, Univ. of Minnesota, 1929, pp. 189 ff.; and W. S. Mackie's recent analysis, "The Demons' Home in Beowulf," *JEGP*. xxxvii (1938), 455 ff.

² *Beowulf and the Fight at Finnsburg*, Boston, 3rd ed. 1936, p. 183.

nán and written out in Old Irish prose during the tenth or eleventh century, that is about two hundred or three hundred years after the saint's own time. It will be seen that the first sentences of this description quoted below are particularly close to the *Beowulf* setting (correspondences in which are noted, the Old English passages being too well known to need citing at length). The translation used for the *Fis Adamnáin* is the excellent literal one by C. S. Boswell.³

Woe unto him unto whom that land shall be for a lasting inheritance, even for ever and ever! For this is the nature of it: Mountains,⁴ caverns,⁵ and thorny brakes;⁶ plains,⁷ bare and parched, with stagnant haunted lochs.⁸ The soil is rough and sandy, very rugged,⁹ ice-bound.¹⁰ Broad fiery flagstones bestrew the plain. Great seas are there, with horrible abysses,¹¹ wherein is the Devil's constant habitation and abiding-place. Four mighty rivers cross the middle of it: a river of fire,¹² a river of snow, a river of poison, a river of black murky water. In these wallow eager hosts of demons, after making their holiday and their delight in tormenting the souls.¹³

The resemblances are not, I think, conspicuous enough for any precise connection between the two descriptions. Yet an early Celtic analogue is especially interesting on account of the possible influence of Irish legends

³ *An Irish Precursor of Dante*, London, 1908, § 30, p. 43. For text, sources, background and for related Irish pieces, cf. St. John D. Seymour's papers, "The Eschatology of the Early Irish Church," *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* xiv (1923), 179 ff.; "The Vision of Adamnan," *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy* xxxvii, Section C, no. 15 (Dublin, 1927), 304 ff.; also "Studies in the Vision of Tundal," *ibid.* no. 4 (1926), 87 ff. Dr. Seymour has established that the *Fis* is a composite work, and that §§ 21-30 (including the passage quoted below), the so-called *Adamnan II* which deals with the torments, are a later addition. Boswell (*op. cit.*) included a useful comparison of the piece with Dante's great vision; we may note (since Dr. Seymour does not) that this comparison has been extended in papers by the Parsi scholar Jivanji Jamshedji Modi (collected in his *Dante Papers*, Bombay, 1914) to include the remarkable Iranian vision described in the *Virāf-nāmeḥ* of Ardāi Virāf (of very uncertain date).

⁴ *Beow.* 1358 f.: *windige næssas, fyrgen (strēam)*; 1411: *neowle næssas*; etc.

⁵ *B.* 1358: *wulfhleopu* (cf. Norman E. Eliason, *JEGP* xxxiv [1935], 20 ff.).

⁶ *B.* 1364: *wudu wyrtum fæst*; 1369: *holtwudu*; 1414: *fyrgebeamas*; 1416: *wynlēas wudu*.

⁷ *B.* 1405: *ofer myrcan mōr*; 1413: *wong*.

⁸ *B.* 1361 f.: *flōd under foldan, mere*; 1364, 1425: *wæter*; 1435: *holm*; 1416 f.: *wæter under stōd drēorig ond gedrefed*; also 1630: *lagu drūsade*; etc.

⁹ *B.* 1409 f.: *stige nearwe, enge ānpaḍas, uncūð gelād*.

¹⁰ *B.* 1363: *hrinde bearwas* (cf. Henry G. Lotspeich, *JEGP* xxix [1930] 367 ff.); 1415: *hār stān (?)*.

¹¹ *B.* 1409: *stēap stānhliðo*; 1421: *holmclif*; etc.

¹² *B.* 1365 f.: *niðwundor, fyr on flōde*.

¹³ The original in the earlier Lebor na hUlidre version, (Lebor na hUlidre, ed. by R. J. Best and O. Bergin, Dublin 1929, p. 75) runs as follows:

Mairg dia mba dognas diles in ferand sin tria bithu sir! Ar is amlaid atá: Slebe tolla delgn echa and, maige loma dano, is iat loistcthecha ocus locha bréna biastaide. Talam garb ganmide, iss e ucrcom aigreta. Lecca lethna tentide fora lár. Mara móra co n-aibthinib adhuathmara ib ina mbi aiddé ocus aittreb Diabail do grés. Cethri sroth dermára dara lár: sruth tened, sruth snechtaide, sruth néimthe, sruth usci duib dorchai. Is intib sin nos fotræcet slúaiḡ digair na ndemna a haithle a n-oenaiḡ ocus a n-aniusa oc pianad na n-anmand.

on the Grendel story; ¹⁴ in particular as Klaeber has noted, ¹⁵ "the brilliant picture of the monster's mysterious haunt might well remind us of Celtic fancy."

King's College, London.

L. WHITBREAD.

Titania and the Changeling

There are few more idyllic fancies in our literature than the fairies in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. But the idyllic quality will certainly be lessened if we ask and endeavour to answer these three questions:

Why was Titania so stubborn in refusing to give Oberon the changeling?

Why was Oberon so determined to have him?

Why did he employ love-juice to get him?

To each question there is the same answer: Because Titania had made the boy her lover; and to this answer there is only one obstacle, the equation of Titania with Diana.

This equation depends upon three points none insuperable.

One is the fact that in the *Metamorphoses* Ovid uses *Titania* as a synonym for *Diana*. But that Titania and Diana are one and the same in Ovid is no reason for assuming that they are one and the same in Shakespeare, especially when the evidence points to the contrary. And it does.

Secondly, there is the hint in the Variorum note on Titania. The note reads as follows:

KEIGHTLEY (*Fairy Myth*, ii, 127): It was the belief of those days that fairies were the same as the classic Nymphs, the attendants of Diana: "That fourth kind of spiritis", says King James, 'quilk be the gentilis was called Diana, and her wandering court, and amongs us called the *Phairie*'. The Fairy-Queen was therefore the same as Diana, whom Ovid frequently styles Titania.

But the Titania of classic myth was the goddess of virginity. The Titania of Shakespeare is married.

¹⁴ As urged, e.g. by Max Deutschbein, "Die sagenhistorischen und literarischen Grundlagen des Beowulfepos," *Germanisch-Romanische Monatsschrift*, I (1909), 103 ff. (cp. the reply of Oscar L. Olson, "Beowulf and The Feast of Bricriu," *MP*, xi [1914], 407 ff.); and by C. W. von Sydow, "Beowulf och Bjarke," *Studier i Nordisk Filologi*, Vol. xiv, no. 3, Helsingfors, 1923; "Beowulfskalden och nordisk tradition," *Yearbook of the New Society of Letters at Lund* *Arsbok* 1923, pp. 73 ff. Other (classical and medieval) analogues of details in the description of the monsters' haunt have been collected by A. S. Cook, *MLN*, xxii (1907), 146 f., and Roberta D. Cornelius, "Palus Inamabilis," *Speculum* ii (1927), 321 ff.

¹⁵ *op. cit.*, p. xxi.

Thirdly, there is the Elizabethan conception that the fairies were fierce guardians of chastity. Mr. Latham in his book *Elizabethan Fairies* expresses it thus:

Of equal intensity with the fairies' passion for cleanliness was their dislike of lust and lechery ... Unchastity they refused to countenance, and they took few chances of overlooking a sinner. (p. 133).

But there is no obstacle here. Shakespeare has made capital out of the idea, not by retaining it, but by inverting it.

His Titania is certainly not the goddess of virginity. Oberon is nearer the truth when he calls her 'a wanton'. In fact, the greeting which the fairy king and queen exchange in Act II is remarkably pregnant:

Obe. Ill met by moonlight, proud Titania.

Tita. What, jealous Oberon! Fairies, skip hence:
I have forsworn his bed and company.

Obe. Tarry, rash wanton: am I not thy lord?

Tita. Then I must be thy lady: ...

The key words are 'proud', 'rash' and 'jealous'.

It seems a little inadequate to explain 'proud' in this context, as Schmidt does in the *Shakespeare-Lexicon*, as "selfish, cold, unkind". It obviously has here an implication of another common meaning, which Dr. Johnson expresses in the phrase, "salacious: eager for the male". The meaning is frequently punned on by Shakespeare in very varied contexts. It is sufficient to quote one, for the noun 'pride', in Sonnet XCIX:

The *forward* violet thus did I chide:

Sweet thief, whence didst thou steal thy sweet that smells,

If not from my love's breath? *The purple pride*

Which on *thy soft cheek* for complexion dwells,

In my love's veins thou hast too grossly dy'd ...

'Rash' is more difficult. "Hasty, impetuous, reckless, acting without due regard for consequences" (N.E.D.) might be all that it means here. But it may have a further connotation. There is a set of meanings given in the N.E.D. as "*Sc. and north. dial.*": "Active, fresh, vigorous; brisk, nimble, quick; eager". I quote this for the sake of the last word 'eager'. There are also certain contexts in Shakespeare worth considering as a group:

From *The Rape of Lucrece*:

- (i) First like a trumpet does his tongue begin
To sound a parley to his heartless foe,
Who o'er the white sheet peers her whiter chin
The reason of this rash alarm to know. (ll. 470-3).

- (ii) His honour, his affairs, his friends, his state,
Neglected all, with swift intent he goes
To quench the coal which in his liver glows.
'O rash false heat, wrapp'd in repentant cold,
Thy hasty springs still blasts, and ne'er grows old. (ll. 45-9)

- (iii) To thee, to thee, my heav'd-up hands appeal,
Not to seducing lust, thy *rash* relier; ... (II. 638-9).
- (iv) While lust is in his pride no exclamation
Can curb his heat, or rein his *rash* desires,
Till, like a jade, self-will himself doth tire. (II. 705-7).

From *Othello* :

- (i) *Iago* (of Cassio)
Sir, he is *rash* and very sudden in choler, ... (II. i. 280).
- (ii) *Lod.* (of Othello)
Where is this *rash* and inconsiderate man? ... (V. ii. 283)
- (iii) *Oth.* She was false as water.
Emil. Thou art *rash* as fire, to say
That she was false; O, she was heavenly true. (V. ii. 134).

From *A Midsummer Night's Dream* :

Obe. Tarry, *rash* wanton.

What I am suggesting is that 'rash' can often be interpreted as 'eager' with the added connotation 'sexually eager, hot, sensual'. In support of this, the compound epithet from *The Merchant of Venice* (III. ii. 109), 'rash-embraced' can be adduced and that somewhat enigmatical person referred to in *Measure for Measure* (IV. iii.), 'Master Rash', who is imprisoned for "a commodity of brown paper and old ginger". Whatever be the sin of 'old ginger', 'paper' is, as Schmidt puts it, "a substance made to write on" (compare *Othello* IV. ii. 71.: "Was this fair paper, this most goodly book, Made to write whore upon"), and 'brown' is, as we are told in *As You Like It* (III. iv.), the 'dissembling colour' (compare Henry VIII, III. ii. 295., "brown wench".) 'Commodity' is slang for 'harlot'.

On the word 'jealous', which means 'suspicious', and often 'suspicious in love', one may perhaps save most space by quoting part of the article in the N.E.D. *verbatim* :

2. Ardently amorous; covetous of the love of another, fond, lustful. Obs. ...
c. 1430 *Syr Gener.* 1070. The Quene had a ful licorous eye And a hert ful ameraus,
On Generides she wax gelous.
1555 BRADFORD in *Styrpe Eccl. Men.* (1721) III. App. xlv. 130, I sawe certayne
letters sent from th'Emprour ... wherein was containned theis privities ... the good simple
Quene is jelous over my soon ... we shall make her agree vnto all our requestes etc.

Whether my suggestions concerning 'rash' are fully justified or not, Titania is what Oberon calls her, 'a wanton'. If we accept that, we need have no doubts about the line, referring to the changeling's mother,

[She] was a votaress of my order ...

The whole speech which follows fits, or rather, supports, the suggestion :

Set your heart at rest :

The fairy land buys not the child of me.
 His mother was a votaress of my order :
 And, in the spiced Indian air, by night,
 Full often hath she gossip'd by my side ;
 And sat with me on Neptune's yellow sands,
 Marking the embarked traders on the flood ;
 When we have laugh'd to see the sails conceive
 And grow big-bellied with the wanton wind ;
 Which she with pretty and with swimming gait
 Following, — her womb then rich with my young squire, —
 Would imitate, and sail upon the land,
 To fetch me trifles, and return again,
 As from a voyage, rich with merchandise.
 But she, being mortal, of that boy did die ;
 And for her sake do I rear up her boy ;
 And for her sake I will not part with him. (II. i. 121-137).

This last remark is, of course, a lie. Titania was in love with the changeling, the 'loved boy'. (II. i. 26). In the first place it makes good sense; and secondly she treats the boy precisely as she treats Bottom when enamoured of him. Her conduct to the boy is described in II. i.:

But she perforce withholds the loved boy,
 Crowns him with flowers, and makes him all her joy : ...

and her similar handling of the weaver in IV. i.:

... she his hairy temples then had rounded
 With a coronet of fresh and fragrant flowers ; ...

In brief, the story of the fairy scenes may be summarised thus :

Oberon, King of the Fairies, has lost the love of his consort, Titania. He is suspicious ('jealous', in the Elizabethan sense) of her relations with a changeling, whom even one of her retainers refers to as the 'loved boy'. His suspicions are confirmed by her resolute refusal to part with the boy :

The fairy land buys not the child of me.

Oberon is not only suspicious of his wife, he is jealous of her in another sense: he is eagerly desirous to regain her love. Open quarrelling does not achieve his aims and he falls back on policy. His scheme is a bold one. By magic art he makes Titania fall in love again. In this second 'dotage' the changeling means nothing to her, she surrenders him without a thought :

I then did ask of her her changeling child ;
 Which straight she gave me, and her fairy sent
 To bear him to my bower in fairy land. (IV. i. 62-4).

Titania gives Oberon the changeling in order to be left in peace with Bottom. Once the boy is in his power Oberon removes the spell from Titania and her first words on waking are the measure of his success :

My Oberon! what visions I have seen!

He is once more master of his wife's affections and with kingly grace he concludes the matter:

Now thou and I are new in amity.

Note. Any doubt as to whether brown is indeed the 'dissembling colour' will be quelled by reference to the following piece of dialogue from *Troilus and Cressida* (I. ii. 100-107):

Pandarus ... Helen herself swore the other day, that Troilus, for a brown favour (for so 'tis, I must confess,) — Not brown neither.

Cressida. No, but brown.

Pandarus. 'Faith to say truth, brown and not brown.

Cressida. To say truth, true and not true.

This is not merely an argument as to whether Troilus is sunburnt or not. Pandarus begins by quoting Helen's remark that Troilus has a brown face. Then he remembers the second meaning of 'brown' together with Troilus' amorous proclivities — "for so 'tis, I must confess". But he recalls his duty to Troilus in respect of Cressida and contradicts himself at once. Cressida, however, has seen the double point and playfully presses the issue: "No, but brown". Pandarus, pretending to ignore her real meaning, concedes, "brown and not brown". But Cressida insists, and thrusts home with: "To say truth, true and not true". The order is inverted, Latin-wise,

Fracti bello, fatisque repulsi.

Najef (Iraq).

DONALD C. MILLER.

Some Notes on Shakespeare's *Tempest*

(The text quoted is F, the line-numbering that of the Oxford 1-vol. ed.)

I. 2. 20. '*Prospero*, Master of a full poore cell'. This is the first mention of his name, in a context that provides an irony emphasised by alliteration: '*Prospero* ... poore.' 'cell' may mean cot or grot here, but in either case brings out the anchoritic aspect of Prospero.

I. 2. 26-32. Note the tone of affectionately ironical pedantry conveyed by Prospero's deliberate over-emphasis: '*direfull* spectacle ... *very* vertue ... *such* prouision ... so safely ordered ... *no* soule *No not so much* perdition as an hayre ... *any* creature'. This pedantry is reinforced by the rhetorical

tricks of the anacoluthon — 'that there is no soule No not so much perdition as an hayre Betid to any creature' — and of the re-grouped relative clauses — 'any creature in the vessell which thou heardst cry, which thou saw'st sinke'; and by the concluding command — 'Sit downe'.

- I. 2. 37-8. The very minute byds thee ope thine eare,
Obey, and be attentive.

Obey, not Prospero, but the bidding of the minute.

I. 2. 80-1. 'who to aduance, and who to trash for ouertopping A difficulty has always been that though 'trash' is explained as a hunting term, 'ouertopping' is not, but obviously refers to things growing higher than other things. The link may be explained by supposing that 'aduance' suggests trash OED v¹, to hold back, which in its turn suggests trash OED sb¹ in the sense broken-off bits of plants and trees. The transition to the idea of knocking off leaders is then clear.

- I. 2. 175-7. And now I pray you Sir,
For still 'tis beating in my minde; your reason
For raying this Sea-storme?

'tis' can be taken as the problem occupying her mind, or, referring forward, as the 'Sea-storme': the question still puzzles her, and her agitation at the storm still remains.

I. 2. 303-320. Ariel goes out at 303, reappears after making a complete change as a water nymph at 316 and goes out again at 318. Caliban is called at 313, but does not enter till 320. During these lines he is called seven times by Prospero — 'What hoa: slaue; Caliban; Thou Earth thou; Come forth; Come ... when? ... come forth' — and termed a 'Tortoys'. There could hardly be a stronger contrast between Ariel's speed and Caliban's sloth.

- I. 2. 418-424. Most sure the Goddesses
On whom these ayres attend: Vouchsafe my pray'r
May know if you remaine vpon this Island,
And that you will some good instruction giue
How I beare me heere: my prime request
(Which I do last pronounce) is (O you wonder)
If you be Mayd, or no?

The affectation of courtier speech is plain in 'Vouchsafe', the metonymy of 'my pray'r' with its elegant reference back to 'Goddesses', 'remaine', and the antithesis of 'prime — last'.

- I. 2. 449-50. I charge thee
That thou attend me

The explanation usually given is 'attend to'; rather the phrase means 'I order you to go with me', i.e. 'I arrest you'; cf. 'Follow me' 456, 'Follow' 461 and 498. First Prospero arrests Ferdinand, then he tells him the charge (450-453).

I. 2. 483. 'My spirits, as in a dreame, are all bound vp'
Here 'spirits' is the physiological term (OED Spirit sb 16); cf above 481-2, 'Thy Nerues are in their infancy againe. And haue no vigour in them.' Cf also the use of 'spirits' in III. 3. 106.

II. 1. 9-10. *Alons.* Prethee peace.

Seb. He receiues comfort like cold porredge.

Sebastian puns on peace and pease, with reference to pease porridge (pease soup). That cold pease porridge was a popular symbol of the unpleasant should be clear from the nursery rimes:

The man in the moon
Came down too soon
And asked the way to Norwich.
He went to the south
And burnt his mouth
By supping on cold pease porridge.

and:

Pease porridge hot,
Pease porridge cold,
Pease porridge in the pot
Nine days old.

II. 1. 109-10. *Gon.* Is not Sir my doublet as fresh as the day I wore it.
I meane in a sort.

Ant. That sort was well fish'd for.

Antonio puns on the sense 'lot' of 'sort': 'you drew that lot after much fumbling'.

II. 1. 189-92. You are Gentlemen of braue mettall: you would lift the Moone out of her spheare, if she would continue in it fiue weeks without changing.

There has been an attempt to find some occult meaning here, and it is possible that on the analogy of the magnet it was hoped to find a 'metal' that would lift the moon out of her sphere. But the main sense should be plain: 'you are prepared to do the impossible, provided that certain impossible conditions are fulfilled first.'

II. 1. 259-62. though some cast againe,
 (And by that destiny) to performe an act
 Whereof what's past is Prologue, what to come
 In yours, and my discharge.

Editors indicate the pun on 'cast' (continued in 'performe', 'act', 'Prologue', 'discharge'); but do not point out that it clarifies the construction: 'though some were cast up again, and by the fact of being cast up were cast to perform ...'.

II. 2. 14. 'Lo now lo'. This is one of Caliban's words; cf. III. 2. 35, 39.

II. 2. 53. 'she had a tongue with a tang'. Verity explains 'tang' as a variant of twang. The first use of this is recorded in OED as 1669. 'tang'

is more likely here to be sting (OED Tang sb¹); cf. the verb tang (OED v¹), the modern dialect tang v and sb, and tanger.

II. 2. 172. 'an abhominable monster'. A pun with the Renaissance etymology of abominable — ab-hominable: an inhuman monster.

III. 2. 61-3. (I would not so) and would no more endure
This wodden slauerie, then to suffer
The flesh-flie blow my mouth.

The pun 'would — would — wodden' is used to express some attitude in Ferdinand. It might be humorous, but the spirited indignation of the following words rather suggests controlled exasperation. Note that in this scene, as in I. 2, Ferdinand still has the court artificiality that provides so clear a contrast with Miranda's simplicity.

III. 2. 3. 'beare vp, & boord em'. 'beare vp' in two senses — the nautical one continued in 'boord em', and the sense 'don't succumb' — i.e., don't pass out.

III. 2. 3-5. Ste. Seruant Monster, drinke to me.

Trin. Seruant Monster? the folly of this Iland ...

Commentators are puzzled why Trinculo should say 'the folly of this Iland'. The punctuation of F indicates that the ridiculous phrase 'Seruant Monster', repeated contemptuously by Trinculo, makes him reflect on the foolishness of them all. 'Monster' is obviously a ridiculous word in this scene — 'Seruant Monster ... braue Monster ... man-Monster ... Lieutenant Monster ... Monsieur Monster ... ignorant Monster ... half a Fish, and halfe a Monster ... that a Monster should be such a Naturall ... poore Monster' etc. — and in II. 2.

III. 2. 16-17. 'I swam ere I could recouer the shore, fiue and thirtie Leagues off and on.' Stephano does not mean sometimes swimming, sometimes not; he means, now away from and now towards the shore (OED Off and on 2 *Naut.*). He justifies his 'fiue and thirtie Leagues' by saying that the current sometimes carried him off shore.

III. 3. 7-8. Euen here I will put off my hope, and keep it
No longer for my flatterer

'put off' here in the sense 'dismiss from service' (OED Put v¹ 45 f (b)).

III. 3. 55. 'the neuer surfeited Sea' Cf. Twelfth Night I. 1. 10-11: 'thy capacity Receiueth as the sea'.

III. 3. 102-3. Seb. But one feend at a time,
Ile fight their Legions ore.

A punning reference to Luke 8, 30: 'And Jesus asked him, saying, What is thy name? And he said, Legion: because many devils were entered into him.' Cf. Mark 5, 9.

III. 3. 104-6. — their great guilt
(Like poyson giuen to worke a great time after)
Now gins to bite the spirits:

The New Shakespeare (p. 101, note on 106) remarks: "F. 'the spirits'; which is awkward. Some read 'their' for 'the'; but it is simpler to take it as compositor's grammar and leave out the s." It is not necessary to change 'the' to 'their', and wrong to alter 'spirits' to 'spirit'. 'spirits' is used in part by Gonzalo as a term of physiology. Cf. I. 2. 483.

IV. 1. 39. 'Incite them to quicke motion'. There may be play on the sense 'puppet-show' of 'motion' here. Cf. III. 3. 21, where Sebastian calls the banquet dance 'A liuing *Drolierie*'; and V. 1. 36, where Prospero calls some of his ministers 'demy-Puppets'.

V. 1. 150-2. *Alo.*

I wish

My self were mudded in that oo-zie bed
Where my sonne lies:

Cf. III. 3. 100-2: *Alo.* Therefore my Sonne i'th Ooze is bedded; and
I'll seeke him deeper then ere plummet sounded,
And with him there lye mudded.

That this ooze is an important image in the play is also apparent from

V. 1. 79-82:

Their vnderstanding

Begins to swell, and the approaching tide
Will shortly fill the reasonable shore
That now ly foule, and muddy:

V. 1. 181-2. *Mir.* O wonder!

How many goodly creatures are there heere?

Miranda is really the phenomenon to be wondered at. That she calls the others a 'wonder' ironises her naiveté in the same way as Prospero's "'Tis new to thee' (184).

V. 1. 188-196. *Fer.*

she is mortall;

But by *immortall* prouidence, *she's mine*

.....

Of whom, so often I haue heard renowe,

..... *of whom* I haue

Receiu'd a *second* life; and *second* Father ...

Ferdinand retains throughout a certain mannered antithesis and balance in his speech when talking of Miranda. Cf. I. 2. 18-24 'my *prime* request (which I do *last* pronounce)'; III. 1. 1-15 'Sports ... labor; painfull ... Delight; basenesse ... nobly; poore ... rich; quickens ... dead; labours, pleasures; gentle ... crabbed; *Most* busy *lest*'. This '*lest*' is a famous crux, but is usually taken to mean 'least'; and Ferdinand's thread of antithesis is a strong argument for 'least'. Cf. also III. 1. 33-4 'morning ... night'; 37-48 'Admir'd ... Admiration; ey'd ... eare; seuerall ... seuerall; created ... Creatures'.

The conclusion from these brief notes that I should most wish to emphasise is that Ferdinand is sophisticated, and his sophistication is contrasted with Miranda's simplicity.

Lund.

A. H. KING.

War Words.¹ Our invitation to readers to send in specimens of war neologisms is meeting with a gratifying response. This time we have to thank Miss A. M. Rekkers, of Flushing, for a batch of notes, most of which are here reproduced.

a. *Evacuation* and related words. The impetus given to this word-group by the war is further illustrated by the following headline from the Evening News (Nov. 6, 1939): "Hotels may *evacuate*" (the reference is to danger from mines on the Danish coast) — a sense not recorded in the OED. In the paragraph following this headline it says: "Several hotels near the sea front are considering *evacuating*." — In the Daily Express (Feb. 15, 1940) Bristol is called "*Evacuee City*", another instance of the attributive use of this word.² The same paper wrote the next day of "the dispersal of children from the *evacuating* areas" — whether present participle or gerund is a nice nut to crack for those who do not blink the difficulty by calling all such forms 'ings'.³

b. *Billeting*, in the sense given it by present war-time conditions, is used in the Daily Express for Feb. 16 and 17 in the combinations *a billeting allowance*, *b. accommodation*, *b. householders*, *b. officers*, *b. notice* — 'gerunds' all of them, except in the case of the householders, where *billeting* stands for 'providing billets' — the 'billeters' of our February number.⁴

c. *Black-out*.⁵ "The pre-black-out days" (Daily Express, Feb. 15). The "black-out to black-out patrol" (Listener, Feb. 8, 1940) of the R.A.F. is on duty from the end of one black-out to the beginning of the next.

Here may also be mentioned the "twilight" street lamps (News Review, Feb. 1, 1940), and the "siren suits" — a kind of overalls slipped on by ladies for use in air raid shelters during the night. (Miss Rekkers regrets being unable to give a reference, but an example may be found in the Sketch for Nov. 22, 1939).

d. The comic sense implicit in the punning designation of the last specimen is also in evidence in the name "Mae West" given in the R.A.F. to a kind of life-saving jacket, which the wearer has to blow up before use, according to the Listener for Jan. 11, 1940. Further R.A.F. terms are "plobs" for pilots' (weather) observations (Listener, Feb. 2, 1940), and "Monty", a name given by sailors to escort planes. The service in charge of the barrage balloons in the Thames estuary is called the "Balloon Navy"

¹ Cf. *E. S.*, Dec. 1939, p. 272, and Feb. 1940, p. 29.

² The meaning, however, differs from that in the instances given in the Feb. number. In *evacuee mothers (children)* the attributive word is equivalent to *evacuated*, whereas by *Evacuee City* is meant the city of evacuees; Bristol appears to be full of them.

³ In spoken English the intonation would probably settle the question. We plump for the present participle in this case.

⁴ Cf. "Most of her neighbours are struggling with the problem of receiving and billeting young children evacuated from London and other danger zones." (Macmillan Catalogue, Spring 1940.)

⁵ With respect to *black-out* and *black-outed* (see Feb. nr.), Miss R. informs us that she has repeatedly come across the former, but has never seen the latter form.

(ibid., Feb. 15). There also is the field of operation of the "magnetic sweeps" (ibid., Feb. 8) — sweepers of magnetic mines.

e. We will conclude with a few miscellaneous expressions. "For the duration" and "conchies" (conscientious objectors), survivals from the last war, are very much in evidence again. Besides key industries we also have "key men" nowadays.⁶ The Ministry of Information is known as Minnie; in Australia even as "mumbling Minnie", according to the Daily Express. The problem of food supply has given rise to such words and products as *macon* or *mutton bacon*, *mutton ham*, and *venison sausages* (Listener, Feb. 2, 1940). The Daily Express of Feb. 16 & 17 writes of the "fat front", while the Listener of Feb. 22 informs its readers that "all the margarines are to be vitaminised."⁷

From our own observation we may add that it seems to be becoming usual to denote the war of 1914-1918 as the Four-Year War, or the Four Years' War (Times Literary Supplement, March 2, 1940).

* *

The interest of these gleanings from the printed records of war time is not merely that of a collection of linguistic curiosities. Owing to the quickening of national life in times of stress they show more vividly than in quieter periods that language is a function⁸ of social life. "If one adds to conscription, the evacuation of school children and rationing the negative fact of the absence of air raids, one has a list of all the principal events which have radically altered British life during these six months of war." (*Britain To-Day*, March 1, 1940.) There, in traditional literary style, one has a statement of the effect of the war on social life, so far. The reflection of this effect in the more pliant vocabulary of the plain man and his daily or weekly paper is shown in the above notes.

* *

According to the Bibliography in the February number of *American Speech*, *Collier's* of Nov. 11, 1939, contains a note on 'evacuee'. Could any reader lend us a copy?

* *

Further materials will continue to be welcome. We shall be glad if, besides exact indications of source and date, contributors will include as much of the original context as will help to elucidate the expressions and to place them in their appropriate setting. — Z.

⁶ The Supplement of the OED has examples from 1927 and 1929.

⁷ The Supplement of the OED has an example of 'vitaminizing' (pres. part) from 1930.

⁸ In the mathematical sense of the word; see COD. Cf.: "Law is a function of political society" (Carr, *The 20 Years' Crisis*, p. 253).

Andreas Heusler

Andreas Heusler died on February 28. He was not an Anglicist in the ordinary sense, but he held such a central position in the field of Germanic philology that it is only fitting that a short obituary notice should find a place in *English Studies*.

Andreas Heusler was born at Basel, 10 August 1865, and belonged to an old patrician Basel family. His father, a professor of jurisprudence at Basel and a scholar of international repute, and his mother, as well as his four grandparents, were all Basel born. From his father he doubtless inherited his interest in early Germanic law, but he made Germanic philology and literature in the widest sense his domain. After studies at the university of his native city and at Freiburg, he became a Privatdozent at Berlin university in 1890, Professor Extraordinarius in 1894, and Professor in 1913, his chair being that of North Germanic philology. In 1919 he was repatriated, being appointed honorary professor of Germanic philology at Basel, a post which he held till 1936, when he retired.

The list of Andreas Heusler's published works is impressive, and it comprises so different things as studies on Old Norse literature (e.g. *Völo spá* 1887), German dialects (*Der alemannische Konsonantismus* 1888), old German literature (especially *Nibelungensage und Nibelungenlied* 1920), German art history (*Goethe und die italienische Kunst* 1891), but his chief interests were early Germanic poetry and metrics and (particularly) Old Norse literature and civilization. He edited several Icelandic texts, as *Zwei Isländergeschichten* (1897), *Eddica minora* (1903). He wrote studies on Old Norse legal customs (*Das Strafrecht der Isländersagas* 1911), *Zum altisländischen Fehdewesen in der Sturlungenzeit* 1912). He also published *Altisländisches Elementarbuch* (1913, reedited 1920 and 1932). Among his metrical studies may be mentioned *Der Liðpahátt* (1889), *Zur Geschichte der altdeutschen Verskunst* (1891), *Über germanischen Versbau* (1894), *Deutscher und antiker Vers* (1917). The books which will be of the greatest importance for students of English are doubtless his more general works, as *Die altgermanische Dichtung* (in *Handbuch der Literaturwissenschaft*, 1923) and *Deutsche Versgeschichte* (Pauls Grundriss 1925-9).

The above list, which is far from complete, gives an idea of the wide range of Heusler's studies and interests. The writer is not qualified to judge of the majority of Heusler's works, nor is an appraisal necessary, for his position as a scholar is universally recognized. The works of his I do know, especially his *Altgermanische Dichtung*, which no student of English should fail to study carefully, impress me as much by their depth, their scholarly method and the learning of their author, as by the intuition and artistic feeling they betray. Andreas Heusler was as much an artist and a poet as a scholar. This is not least apparent in his treatment of the Old Germanic verse, which gets new life under his hands. The system he uses — a musical notation — brings out the rhythm and swing of the old Germanic verse in a wonderful way.

I had only once an opportunity of meeting Andreas Heusler. It was ten years ago (to be exact, in April 1930), when he was the guest of the Royal Society of Letters here, of which he had just been elected a corresponding member. He then gave a course of three lectures on *Der Antheil der Germanenstämme an der Stabreimdichtung*. I have a very vivid memory of those lectures, but also of the fine tall man, the handsome face with its air of refinement and high breeding, the courtesy and modesty of the great scholar.

Lund.

EILERT EKWALL.

Reviews

Minuet: A Critical Survey of French and English Literary Ideas in the Eighteenth Century. By F. C. GREEN. 489 pp. London: J. M. Dent & Sons Ltd. 1935. Price 15s.

"First published 1935," it says on the title-page of this book. It may, therefore, seem rather late in the day to announce it in 1940 and to recommend it as a work deserving widespread attention. Yet such is the interest it has aroused in the present reviewer, who has not merely read the book, but re-read the greater part of it, pen in hand, in order to control and clarify his first impressions, that he feels no apology is needed. At the same time he would like to emphasize once more the peculiar excellence of two earlier studies by the same author: *French Novelists: Manners and Ideas from the Renaissance to the Revolution* (1928) and *French Novelists from the Revolution to Proust* (1931). These works, which testify to extensive knowledge and to deep insight into the essence of the French spirit, have hardly met with the attention they deserve, to judge by periodical and other publications in this country.¹

"*Minuet*: a slow, stately dance, in triple measure, for two dancers, derived from France in the latter part of the seventeenth century and fashionable throughout the eighteenth." In these terms the *Oxford English Dictionary* defines the movement which gave this book its name; a movement full of grace and reserve, ever and anon joining and separating the dancers, who, with finger-tips linked, keep intact their own personalities, although from every glance and gesture the spectator is able to conclude to the existence of a harmony destined to vanish after the dance is over. All this may be said of the minuet executed in the eighteenth century by

¹ A year ago Green published a book on Stendhal, as yet unknown to me. The subject must be congenial to one so familiar with the spirit of the eighteenth century that permeated this French author. From what Green says in *Minuet* (p. 37), the book must also be an attempt at presenting a new view of Stendhal.

English and French spirit and principle, culture and taste; it still preserved the stateliness, the formality of the classical rhythm of pavane or saraband; it lacked the exuberance of the romantic waltz, which was to bring together France and Germany as well as France and England as partners in intoxication about 1830. 1789 saw the end of the minuet, but in their interplay of approach and evasion the partners had managed to bring into touch the literary conceptions of France and England, destined to impregnate and dominate pre-romanticism and romanticism and make French pseudo-classicism rock on its foundations.

In order to demonstrate this contact of two nations in all its manifestations a profound insight into their nature was needed first and foremost. A Scotsman by birth, for many years a Professor in Toronto, where he found ample opportunity to study people of French origin who have preserved their national character, side by side with the English inhabitants, and possessing a thorough grasp of the two literatures, Green has had opportunity to compare their minds and their spiritual "climates", their powers of assimilation and interpenetration, as well as the elements of snobbishness and misunderstanding that have so often falsified and distorted men's opinions of international relations. A typical misconception of the English critics is their judgment of Voltaire, whom, from the eighteenth century until now, they have considered merely a cynical plagiarist of Shakespeare, an envious ingrate.² Indeed, these two authors are so radically different in purpose, "climate" and personality that the comparative method of presenting analogous scenes, passages and verses from the works of both, must be considered all but valueless. And since this method of argumentation and comparison, of *a priori* convictions, is death to the appreciation of all living art and excludes all blossoming of personal vision or suggestion, Green wanted to write this book.³

"A pioneering feat of the first order".⁴ This is Green's dictum on a book of basic worth, written by Joseph Texte: *Jean-Jacques Rousseau et les origines du cosmopolitisme littéraire* (1895); he calls Texte an "eminent historian", praises him for being "original and suggestive" without concealing the fact that his enthusiasm often plays him false, that his work more than once shows a want of exhaustive knowledge of the lesser authors grouped around Richardson and l'abbé Prévost, even preceding *Pamela*,⁵ that in his

² *Minuet*, page 54, 55 & appendix II. — ³ *Ibid.*, p. 464. — ⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 431.

⁵ Indeed, the lesser authors of small renown are so truly important because they help to formulate and explain a new mental attitude; they are so characteristic of their age and time, being less original and therefore more subject to criticism and more vulnerable. An instance of the application of the method of using second-rate writers in order to place a work of art may be found in Servais Etienne, *Le genre romanesque en France depuis l'apparition de la Nouvelle Héloïse jusqu'aux approches de la Révolution*, Paris, A. Colin, 1922. The way for the truly great is, in fact, more often than not prepared by these third- and fourth-rate authors. Cf. F. Baldensperger, *Goethe en France*, Paris, Hachette, 1904, p. 12.

treatment of the characters of *Clarissa* and *La Nouvelle Héloïse*⁶ his method of comparison must be considered "mechanical and valueless", and that the use of incomplete quotations and bungled translations often leads him to faulty conclusions.

Joseph Texte's method gave rise to a one-sided way of comparing literary products without paying attention to their origins or to the aesthetic and psychological elements on which they are based; his book has found followers and paved the way for an often barren method of parallelisms attacked by Green.⁷ Comparative investigations giving proof of insufficient penetration into the nature of both literatures are closely scrutinized; but Green seems to forget from time to time that they were often undertaken by young scholars as yet untrained in psychology; I mention this because I should like to exhort the author to a degree of leniency where he attacks Barton⁸ on Sterne-Diderot, Roland Elissa-Rhaïs⁹ on Defoe-Prévost, and sharply disputes Lounsbury's¹⁰ opinions, quite untenable, indeed, nowadays, on Shakespeare-Voltaire. Finally in his researches into the assimilation and the interpenetration of the literatures of England and France Green comes to an "irresistible conclusion", which pretty well upsets the generally accepted thesis of Joseph Texte¹¹ and recommends in the first place a thorough study of the artist, his genius, the traditional spirit of his race and epoch as expressed in his works.¹² This recommendation applies more especially to poetry, where, more than in any other art, the spirit and taste of a nation supply the elements most difficult to assimilate. Essays in periodicals and translations may be manifestations of interest, but they do not prove that a change of mind and of taste has really taken place.¹³ In the end we always return to the problem of the inscrutable and accidental "influences" or "sources" resulting from emotional phenomena, the embodiment of which in a work of art constitutes the secret of genius and talent. In fact, the study of this problem may lead, as Green wishes, to a clearer idea of the nature of imaginative literature without the help of scientific argumentation. A pronouncement such as "Voltaire was never really influenced by Shakespeare, for the very excellent reason that he never understood his art"¹⁴

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 401, cf. p. 431. Compare a broader discussion of Richardson's influence in *French Novelists: Manners and Ideas*, London & Toronto, J. M. Dent & Sons Ltd., 1938, p. 192 ff. Texte's ideas are also disputed elsewhere, *Minuet*, p. 399, 412, 421.

⁷ *Minuet*, p. 464: "Of these (viz. theses and articles) many are admirable, but there are others which, from an excess of zeal, have tended to prove too much and to suggest too little. To them the present survey owes its genesis."

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 462. — ⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 314 and Appendix I.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 55, 66, 128 and Appendix I.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 463: "the irresistible conclusion that the cosmopolitan spirit left no deep and lasting imprint upon the imaginative literature of the eighteenth century in France or England"; cf. p. 288. — ¹² *Ibid.*, p. 363.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 388: "Thomson, Young and Macpherson were never really assimilated by the eighteenth century French writers. Only in so far as they already had something in common with French taste were they imitated. What was essentially English vanished in the process. Pope is in a different case." — ¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 56; cf. p. 72.

may look like a paradox, but in reality it poses the essential problem of assimilation by mind and taste in its strictest form. Green likes to scatter pithy sayings of this kind, like a handful of squibs; hence the liveliness and humour of his argument; one is reminded of George Saintsbury¹⁵ and his sallies.

Minuet is divided into three books, dealing with Drama (190 pages), Poetry (110 pages) and The Novel (160 pages), roughly proportional to the importance usually attached to the international relations for the three different kinds in this century; two pages suffice for an introduction, half a page for a conclusion. A couple of sentences explain the author's attitude towards a few problems posed by him concerning the causes of this Anglo-French exchange of ideas, the true nature of this *rapprochement*, the permanent influence (if any) on the national spirit of the two literatures and the differences between their national traditions. This attitude is explained by him as follows: "Like all matters that concern such elusive quantities as literary taste and influence, they are most certainly not "problems" to be solved by any so-called scientific, critical method. They can only be discussed in a spirit of sympathetic and optimistic inquiry";¹⁶ his duty as a critic is "to suggest and to interpret."¹⁷

The first book, *Drama*, explains the relations between the Theatre and the Church, "le peuple", "society"; the difficulties experienced by the authors in the battle between official and unlicensed theatres and because of their position in society; the activity of the critics; the ever growing leaning towards realism in the style of acting, though nobody is inclined to look askance at a Phèdre in full court-dress or a Hamlet "in the dress uniform of a Hanoverian officer". French acting suffers from an excess of politeness, English actors display a distressing lack of *savoir-vivre*, but for the rest, stage conditions are roughly the same on both sides. The first chapter of this book abounds in new aspects and is full of life and vigour.

The second chapter, *The Philosopher and the Dramatist*, proceeds from a comparison between Bacon and Descartes to a parallel between Shakespeare and Racine, which reveals an arresting specimen of sweeping generalization, in the far from incontestable thesis: "Like Descartes, like Molière, Racine moves from the general to the particular: Shakespeare, on the other hand, works from the complex and local to the universal."¹⁸ However, here too one is impressed by the terseness of expression¹⁹ and the profound insight

¹⁵ P. 141 on Manon's intelligence; p. 153 on *l'Irrésolu* by Destouches; p. 237 Mrs. Sadie Goldstumpf!; p. 296 on "the old distrust of enthusiasm and imagination" of the Church; p. 382 "Richardson ... could make the binomial theorem sound indecent." Richardson is his "bête noire", he hates Pamela (p. 372, 380-2, 420). As is the case with Saintsbury, Green is not always quite clear, because of his personal allusions and the tartness of his remarks.

¹⁶ *Minuet*, p. 2. — ¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 464. — ¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 39.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 45: "Racine is primarily a dramatist and only accidentally a poet; in Shakespeare, poet and playwright are almost completely interfused."

into the nature of both nations, so characteristic of Green²⁰. Indeed, the essential gift brought us by classical as opposed to Shakespearian drama is a social art, the delineation of men and women leaving the social plane.²¹

The next chapters are devoted to the Shakespeare-Voltaire parallel and to Shakespeare *versus* French dramatic tradition; both lead to comparison; they convince us of the fact that Voltaire was not, in any way, able to fathom and assimilate the English spirit; they remind us once more of the different phases of his criticism in the discussions of Grimm, Baretti and Mrs. Montagu. The information given by the first visitors to England — l'abbé Prévost, l'abbé Blanc — concerning the French theatre as well as the aims and attainments of La Place's and Letourneur's translations of English plays are fully explained by Jusserand.²² Green fills up some gaps left by Jusserand²³ and goes on to scrutinize the efforts of Shakespeare's imitators²⁴ who remodelled his plays as "des drames bourgeois", such as "*Le Vieillard et ses Trois Filles*" by Mercier (1792), who turns "*King Lear*" into a lecture to ungrateful children²⁵, while in the meantime in England *Lear* and *Hamlet* were as freely butchered, a crime against which a Frenchman, De la Coste, voices his indignation²⁶. Summarizing the contents of these two chapters, Green comes to the conclusion, that they make plain "how little actual significance attaches to statements about the profound influence exercised by Shakespeare on French dramatic taste", and further that they "show the unreasonableness of supposing that the contact with Shakespeare at this period could possibly affect, in any real fashion, the spirit of French drama"²⁷.

Chapter V, *Contacts in Tragedy*, deals principally with some English adaptations of Corneille, Racine and Voltaire and with the relations between French drama and English domestic tragedy, genres which were a great success with the rising of the middle classes in both countries; Green studies more especially Lillo's *George Barnwell* (1731) in relation to the theories of Diderot, to *Manon*, Mercier and La Harpe; as well as the *Gamester* by Edward Moore (1753) and Saurin's *Béverlei*. But there can be no question of any strong influence on the drama; on neither side of the Channel — witness the rejection of *l'Honnête Criminel* by Garrick²⁸ — is the spirit of the nation open to influence from the other. After Molière, comedy is but "a sad array of third-rate works cast in the mould created

²⁰ His remarks concerning the Englishman's continued failure to understand Racine, p. 38, 41, 42-43, 52. — ²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 98.

²² Concerning this book of Jusserand Green is right in declaring: "In his excellent *Shakespeare en France* (sous l'ancien régime), a pioneer work and a classic"; *ibid.*, p. 82, note 4. This book dates 1898. — ²³ *Ibid.*, p. 97-99.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, on page 113 Green lays stress upon Douin's version of *Othello*, which failed to find a producer.

²⁵ Still Green's remark that one might expect from Mercier a form of tragedy very near to Shakespeare's drama, not so much in the heroic or national manner, but rather a kind of democratic melodrama, p. 174, must be considered sound and well founded.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 127; De la Coste, *Voyage philosophique d'Angleterre* (1786).

²⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 128; cf. p. 147. — ²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 146.

by the Master" ²⁹; Marivaux, who gave us so much that may be considered original, cannot be said to have affected the English theatre directly: Bickerstaffe, Conway, Murphy, Sophia Lee may have borrowed some little tricks of characterization and situation from the French, Thomas Holcroft may have rehashed *Le Mariage de Figaro* as a tenth-rate farce, but a real penetration of the French spirit into the English theatre does not occur, nor did Sedaine with *Le Roi et le Fermier* or Collé with *La Partie de Chasse d'Henri IV* — which still figures on the theatre bills — both inspired by Dodsley's *Miller of Mansfield*, take over a particle of English psychology. The conventional conception of the British character, on the one hand a "sort of cross between Sir Charles Grandison and Hamlet", on the other a creature "... comically eccentric and brutal, but at heart goodnatured and generous", prevents the French from being attracted to English comic art; they fail to achieve the fusion of the comic and the sentimental found in *The Rivals* or in Kelly's *False Delicacy* ³⁰. This difference of conception by the comic authors of the 18th century arises from the difference of national tendency; the French want to illustrate and to define their characters by situation, the English are inclined to subordinate character to situation ³¹; both nations retain their own positions.

In the sixth chapter, *The Survival of Comedy*, Green finds occasion for a witty and searching analysis of Marivaux's conception of love, disputing at the same time the assertions of Larroumet and Lanson who recognise in Marivaux's works Watteau and his "Land of Dreams" ³². His speculations on the nature of the British character, on the value of Mme Riccoboni's *Nouveau Théâtre anglais*, on the triumph of romanticism, and on sensibility among the two nations, on the Englishman's predilection for eccentrics or "humorists" versus the Frenchman's preference for the "généralement humain", as well as his study of Beaumarchais, whom he prizes above Sheridan and Goldsmith and whose *Barbier* he considers "perhaps the most completely French comedy in existence" ³³, recognising in it the *furia francese*, — all these things, together with such a pronouncement as: "it is in the eighteenth, not in the nineteenth century, that we must seek the Victorian era of French literature" ³⁴ combine to make a whole worthy of meditation.

The second book, *Poetry*, comprises five chapters. Whilst the first book opens with the parallel Bacon-Descartes, Green begins this one with a comparison between Boileau and Pope, which ends in a eulogy of the

²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 149. — ³⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 174. — ³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 181. — ³² *Ibid.*, p. 156.

³³ *Ibid.*, p. 191. A suggestive remark about the personality of Chérubin and its influence on the Chevalier d'Eon and a sneer at the illuminati of Freudian symbolism.

³⁴ P. 151, cf. p. 162. Of course discussion is impossible here; still I should like to call attention to the international Victorian mentality which made its appearance in all the countries of Europe, equally wearied by romanticism. A *bourgeois* mentality, more bourgeois still than that of the eighteenth century. During the whole of the second Empire with its unsavoury reputation the theatre presented an aspect of morality quite Victorian in its effects. One should try to read Théodore Barrière! And yet under Napoléon III he was considered subversive.

latter³⁵, rather paradoxically, since a few quotations do not suffice to characterise the essence of a poet. Voltaire and Pope, didactic and philosophic poets both, may exist side by side, their styles are totally different; the former's alexandrines flow so easily, yet are from time to time so corrosive and acid, that Green comes to the conclusion that "the Hybla bees ... carried no pollen into France"³⁶. A comparison of lesser French poets, for whom only "la difficulté vaincue" is of interest, with English ones, whose considerable esthetic originality is paralysed by three important linguistic factors: Shakespeare, the Bible and the Classics³⁷, shows us how great an effort is needed to shake off conventional classicism. About 1743 the French began to translate English poetry; l'abbé Yart in his *Idée de la Poésie anglaise* (1749) has the same imperfections as La Place in his *Théâtre anglais* (1745-1748); they both attempt to dress their model in a French garment, in accordance with French tradition.

Colardeau's *Héloïse*, Dorat's adaptation of the tale of Inkle and Yarico,³⁸ the *Heroids* — "emotional cocktails", Green calls them³⁹ — all contain features which served to prepare the way for the appreciation of Thomson, Young and Ossian and of the poetry of enthusiasm and imagination (the Wharton brothers, Blair, "poor" Collins, Gray); but in reality no single particle of the pre-romantic spirit of this renovated form of poetry found its way into the adaptations and translations, in spite of the attention paid to English poetry by the French "journaux". Green is careful to emphasize the difference in general tone of the two literatures: "On the whole, the Romantics of our country sought to appeal to the sensations rather than to the sensibilities."⁴⁰ The poetry of Ossian and Young induces Green to attack the ideas of Van Tieghem, as expressed in his *Ossian en France* and in his essay *Le Prérromantisme*.⁴¹

English influence on French poetry and on the traditional French spirit is so trifling, that Green is also prepared to conclude that the influence of Thomson, Young and Ossian "has been much over-rated if not actually misunderstood",⁴² notwithstanding the success they achieved.⁴³

Five more chapters form the last book, *The Novel*. A parallel between Manon Lescaut and Moll Flanders, "two prostitutes", leads to a comparison of the characteristic realism contained in the two novels with a discussion of the elements of tragedy and of the influence of *La Princesse de Clèves*,

³⁵ P. 196: "It is time, surely, to jettison the comfortable legend that Pope is the English Boileau and Boileau the French Pope." And on page 197 Pope has become all but a forerunner of Baudelaire. Is this also a squib? — ³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 204.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 206, cp. p. 215.

³⁸ Cf. *Inkle and Yarico Album* by Marsden Price, since published by the Univ. of California Press, 1938. — ³⁹ *Minuet*, p. 228.

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 268, cf. p. 257 concerning *Les Saisons* by Saint-Lambert; p. 267, 258 and Green on "romantic" and "romanesque" p. 267. Why does not he mention P. Trahard, *Les Maîtres de la sensibilité française*, 4 vol. Paris, Boivin, 1931, 1933?

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, p. 269, 279, 289, and App. II. — ⁴² *Ibid.*, p. 229, cf. p. 300.

⁴³ A subtle remark on the numerous reasons for Ossian's success on p. 283.

which Green, in my opinion, overrates,⁴⁴ though it may indeed be considered "the first great love-novel in any language". Quite rightly he attacks the opinion of Paul Hazard who assumes the existence of Jansenist elements in *Manon*;⁴⁵ he directs our attention to the melodramatic in Prévost,⁴⁶ and combines an epitome of the traces of the author's own personality in some of his characters⁴⁷ with a description of the creation by Prévost of a "stage" Englishman of eighteenth century France⁴⁸. Interesting, though not quite convincing, is Green's suggestion that Prévost "amused himself by an essay in the 'English' manner of writing, though the author who inspired him was not Defoe but George Lillo. This was in the curious *Histoire de Molly Sibilis*, an abbreviated parody in the *George Barnwell* style, of his own *Manon Lescaut*."⁴⁹

Gil Blas and *Roderick Random*, "unheroic heroes", lead to a study of the comic, realistic, and satirical elements in Le Sage and Smollett; here Green strongly emphasizes the scepticism of the former regarding the possibilities of human perfection, against the sensitive tendencies of Smollett, with his liking for melodrama and his inclination towards *gauloiserie*, "the enlightened but invisible humanitarian".⁵⁰ Green declares that it is just this quality of humaneness which is lacking in Le Sage; though I doubt this. A complete difference in principle, in the conception of the art of translation, of realism, of humour as well as of psychological analysis makes Smollett the opposite of the classicist Le Sage, even though he professes, in his introduction to *Roderick Random*, to have modelled his novel on *Gil Blas*.

Chapter XIV, *Wise Virgins*, is principally a study of the heroines of Richardson's novels in connection with Marivaux⁵¹; sensitivity and eroticism in the novel, the relative proportions of realism and idealism, of dramatic elements, of morality and convention, of humour (and more specially the lack of it) and subtlety are discussed in a parallel, amusing, violent, paradoxical, not always quite fair, in which Green seems inclined to forget that the spirit of the age is an element from which Richardson could not easily escape. A comparison of *The Adventures of Joseph Andrews* and *Le Paysan Parvenu*, of Fielding and of Marivaux, affords an opportunity to study the comical powers of the English and the French, which show a considerable difference of expression, of comical effect, especially in respect of their study of humanity in general, which in the French author remains

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 303-306, cf. p. 417.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 309, cf. F. C. Green in *The Modern Language Review* XXXIII, no. 4 (October 1938) and the recently published book of Cl.-E. Engel, *Figures et aventures du XVIIIe siècle*. Paris, Ed. "Je sers", 1939, which assumes calvinistic tendencies in Prévost.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 307. Green is more lenient here towards Prévost than later towards Richardson, p. 348.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 308. — ⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 314.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 331, cf. the discussion by Cl.-E. Engel, *op. cit.*, p. 154. — ⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 362.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 365: "Texte dismissed the notion that Richardson borrowed the theme of *Pamela* from Marivaux's *Vie de Marianne*." Concerning this problem see A. E. H. Swaen, *Marianne-Pamela* in *Neophilologus*, XXIII, no. 4, p. 169, where, in my opinion, a completely valid conclusion is reached.

classical and national, although in his youth he may, as a self-styled 'modern', have made game of the classics.⁵²

Mr. Robert Lovelace, Saint-Preux, Valmont, *Three Seducers*, heroes all of epistolary novels, afford once again an opportunity, not only for a severe judgment of Richardson — and similarly of the method of Joseph Texte — but also for a comparison of the three principal characters in the different novels; here too the influence of the English author cannot be traced; it is especially the psychological relation between the couples Julie-Wolmar and Clarissa-Solmes that is different. Saint-Preux can by no means be considered a satanic professional lover like Lovelace, however imbued with romanticism both may be. Choderlos de Laclos and his *Liaisons Dangereuses* lack any connection with Richardson. Choderlos' cruel novel still remains an enigma in the history of fiction; as a final conclusion I can only think that this ambitious military gentleman, who, in his forties, set out to write this masterpiece of merciless psychology, gave rein to a personal craving for vengeance, because of some slight, some moral or social outrage suffered in his youth, and because of the disenchantment, the causes and dimensions of which we cannot fathom, of a man who feels himself haunted by the "démon de midi."⁵³ Texte's assertion that the origin of Diderot's *La Religieuse* as well as of *Le Paysan Perversi* and *La Paysanne Pervertie* by Rétif de la Bretonne may be traced to Richardson, is easily refuted by Green; I agree with him that all three novels are "quite original and, in their prevailing colour, absolutely French."⁵⁴ Gaudet d'Arras must surely also be considered wholly French, a picture of decadence and corruption, of the psychology of the abnormal in a period which contained such painters of human nature as Rétif and Laclos, as well as Bernardin de Saint-Pierre and Marmontel. A comparison of *Jacques le Fataliste* and *Tristram Shandy* leads to a study of the nature of Diderot and Sterne, which ends on the following statement: "As an artist, he (viz. Diderot) remains essentially French."⁵⁵ Here I should like to observe that, for all that, Diderot had found in Sterne an example of the discursive method of writing.

⁵² Concerning the continuation, even with our contemporaries Mauriac, Duhamel and Giraudoux, of the traditional idea of the classical authors and critics, that literary art ought in the first place to portray man, "l'homme", see the excellent work of Daniel Mornet, *Introduction à l'Etude des Ecrivains d'aujourd'hui*, Paris, Boivin, 1939.

⁵³ Cf. Green, *French Novelists*, I, p. 222. Green calls this book "A regular manual of seduction", p. 421; "he parodies Saint-Preux with ill-disguised mockery", p. 423; (in Mme de Merteuil) "we have the romantic *femme fatale*, the Célia of the eighteenth century", p. 428. I repeat these opinions, because, although I cannot dispute them here, I do not agree with them. Fortunately, Green is not so little affected by this wonderful and profound masterpiece as Saintsbury appears to be, to judge from his violent condemnation in his *History of the French Novel*, London, Macmillan, 1919, vol. I. p. XIV.

⁵⁴ Minuet, p. 439.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 463 and 456. Cf. S. Etienne, *op. cit.*, p. 297: "Jacques le Fataliste et le Neveu de Rameau, négligés par lui (Diderot), doivent beaucoup plus à Sterne qu'à Richardson. Aussi l'auteur tumultueux du grandiloquent *Eloge de Richardson* n'a rien fait que le vanter." Cf. Minuet, p. 449. Cf. the opinion of Lord Morley, who declared that "*La Religieuse* n'aurait pas été écrite s'il n'y avait eu Richardson en Angleterre", in order to realise our progress since 1891. Yet Trahard, *op. cit.*, II, p. 166 still accepts this influence.

I have sought to survey this "critical survey of French and English literary ideas", and if, just as Green expatiates rather freely on the plots of the novels discussed in this book, I have been tempted to be lavish with quotations, it is because this book is so novel, fresh, interesting and courageous. The opinions expressed are not always acceptable, and here and there I would like to raise questions⁵⁶ and offer corrections⁵⁷, but it is a work that merits the attention of scholars, and I hope that I have succeeded in pointing out its value as a corrective and a source of fresh suggestions, even though I have not concealed its imperfections.

Amsterdam.

K. R. GALLAS.

[Transl. J. MASCHMEIJER-BUEKERS.]

⁵⁶ "After the Marlborough campaigns it dawned upon a few Frenchmen that England ... might ... conceivably have a literature and a civilization or sorts." Thus the opening sentence of *Minuet*. "A few Frenchmen" must be taken relatively. But the author is acquainted with G. Ascoli's *La Grande Bretagne devant l'opinion française au XVII^e siècle* (1930), which does not indeed reveal an overwhelming interest in England, but nevertheless mentions the existence of that interest (part II, book III and bibliography). — P. 57: Lanson in his edition of the *Lettres Philosophiques*, II-95, is rightly more prudent in his opinion of what Voltaire saw of the plays of Shakespeare during the years 1726-1728. — P. 335: Here I am inclined to ask if Le Sage was really "inclined to favour the seventeenth century school of innate ideas"; are there any proofs for this assertion? — Is this true of the latter's other books besides *Gil Blas*, to which novel Green confines himself? — P. 374: Must Marivaux and Vauvenargues really be reckoned among the bourgeoisie? — Gide's "acte gratuit" cannot be compared with the actions of Valmont and Madame de Merteuil (p. 427). — P. 421: Can the literary figure of Molière's *Don Juan* be considered as one of the sources of the "stream of literature dealing with seduction and persecution"? Or is this stream but the reproduction of what the authors saw all around them?

⁵⁷ P. 110, line 26: Au défaut de leur bras, il est à toi de frapper, read: c'est à toi ... — P. 302, line 14: Palais Royal, read: Galerie du Palais. — P. 303: The expression "maîtresse femme" does not appear to me well chosen to characterize Madame de Clèves and Phèdre. — P. 353: Figaro's well-known phrase should read: ... de peur d'être obligé d'en pleurer. — P. 379, line 23: the *gros mot* plumps out, read: the *grand mot* ... And is it only "the Breton" who is distinguished from the rest by his "respect for good food and drink"? (p. 346). This from one who must know France — the whole of France — so well!

Essentials of English Grammar. By OTTO JESPERSEN. Pp. 387. London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd. Fourth Impression. 1938. Stiffened Paper Edition, 6s. 6d. net.

For the benefit of those readers who are unacquainted with *The Philosophy of Grammar* and *A System of Grammar* by the same author, it may be well to conduct the present review on the lines of the new grammatical terms suggested by Jespersen. Some of them may be considered lucky hits, others, the majority I fear, are merely new leather bottles for very ancient wines. But then — "No man can speak exactly as everybody else or speak exactly in the same way under all circumstances and at all moments, hence a good deal of vacillation here and there." (Introduction, p. 16.) The new technical terms will indeed, as Jespersen asserts, offer no serious difficulty.

The principal terms that call for explanation are first the words *junction* and *nexus*, the former referring to the union of attributive adjectives and nouns, the latter to every form of predicative combination. As these combinations represent respectively the "static" (totalizing) and the "dynamic" or discursive aspects of thought, I believe their acceptance would mark an advance in grammatical nomenclature and facilitate the discussion of these units of thought and syntax. The term *nexus* is extended to the second part of such types of sentence as *he found the door locked* and even to what other grammarians have called *infinitive* and *gerund clauses* and *nominal constructions*.

Other terms calling for mention are the functional words *primary*, *secondary* and *tertiary*, intended to connote what have traditionally been called *headwords*, *attributes* and *adjuncts*, the terms representing their relative importance or ranks within the sentence, headwords coming first.

Word-classes is not a bad substitute for *parts of speech*, but it may be doubted whether the subsumption of adverbs, prepositions and conjunctions under the common head of particles is any improvement, since the majority of adverbs are as full of meaning as adjectives, and capable of forming separate links in the concatenation of thought, as unmistakably as other predicables.

By the side of the traditional term *apposition* a new one is coined, called *extraposition*, to refer to those words or groups of words which are added by way of after-thoughts and often placed outside the sentence proper, in which they are then represented by a pronoun, as in *Charles Dickens, he was a novelist!* — *There he sat, a giant among dwarfs.*

Amorphous sentences are those verbless utterances which are "more suitable for the emotional side of human nature", the one-word sentences of other grammarians. Amorphous sentences have a wider range however than "elliptic" ones, and are meant to embrace sounds "which are not otherwise used in ordinary speech, such as the click (suction-stop) of compassion, annoyance or impatience conventionally, but imperfectly, written *tut* or *tck*, through single ordinary speech sounds like [f·] to enjoin

silence (conventionally spelled *hush*), or sound-combinations like *hm!* or *ha ha!* and conventional 'interjections' like *alas!* *hullo!* or *hurra!* to single words or word-combinations capable of being used also in the first class of sentences.

As examples of such amorphous or one-member sentences may serve: Yes! | Good bye! | Thanks! | Dear me! | An aeroplane! | etc."

The actual meaning of these sentences often depends to a very great extent on their tone. Yes, for example, may have many different meanings, which can be readily gathered from its intonation. As it is so difficult to say "what exactly is 'left out' or what could be supplied in order to make them into sentences of the recognized type consisting of a subject and a predicate, no explanation by means of ellipsis is available, and it is best to acknowledge amorphous sentences on the same footing as other sentences."

The reader is likely to question the validity of the latter statement. If some sentences are amorphous, they certainly differ from those which are not, and it is hard to see how "morphous" and amorphous sentences can be acknowledged on the same footing. Besides, amorphous sentences are not so shapeless as the meaning of the term would suggest. They do not, strictly speaking, lack form, i.e. a distinct sequence of conventional sounds, any more than regular sentences do. Comparison of the two classes of utterance shows in the great majority of cases that something is indeed wanting in amorphous sentences which is present in non-amorphous ones. Hence what is there in the name *amorphous* to lift it above the dignity or validity of the ancient term *ellipsis*?

In this, as in some other cases, Jespersen lapses into the positivist error of refusing to acknowledge more than what meets the eye or ear.

The term *converted subject* is used with reference to what would have been the subject of an active sentence if the idea had been expressed in an active form, hence with reference to the instrumental adjunct of a passive sentence, as in *The city was destroyed by the French*. The term is open to the objection that there is no conversion in a passive construction, activity and passivity being ultimate elements of thought, and as such mutually uninterchangeable. A passive sentence is just what it is, and there is little use in talking about what it would have been if it had been active, because in that case it would have been non-existent.

Quasi-predicatives is said of such adjuncts of quality as *the best of friends* in *We parted the best of friends*, which in reality predicates something of the subject, though the verb retains its full meaning. Here again one may be pardoned for asking if there is anything "quasi" about these predicatives. The admission that predicatives may be left out (13.9) when sufficiently clear from the context, as in *Is he rich? Yes, he is*, (*Yes, he is; immensely*) shows how difficult it is to get away from the meaning of the term "ellipsis", even if its form is condemned.

The chapters on predicatives and cases are very readable ones. So is that on *person*, where another new coinage appears, viz. the term *generic pronoun*, intended to refer to what is commonly styled the indefinite person,

represented by the pronoun *one* and its equivalents. *Pronouns of contextual indication* is a new name to grace the traditional personal pronouns, *pronouns of pointing* being suggested as a substitute for demonstratives. The definite article, according to the degree of its specification of the noun to which it refers, is said to be *completely* or *incompletely defining*, the former occurring in sentences of the class *Shut the door, please*, the latter in junctions of the class *the grey horse, the boy who showed us the way*, and others. *Same* is called the *pronoun of identity*, such the *pronoun of similarity*.

As regards indefinite pronouns, *certain* is dignified with the name of *pronoun of discretion* and said to refer to some one or something. Now this would seem to be a little slip, because in *Certain of his friends had already begun to suspect him*, the reference is evidently to more than one friend. *Some* is called *pronoun of unspecified quantity*, which can hardly be called a happy innovation. Nor does the term *pronouns of indifference* seem a happy appellation for *any* and *either*. It does not fit such sentences as *I haven't any (money, etc.)*, or *On either side the river lie Long fields of barley and of rye*. One may also question whether *every* and *each* are happily classed with *all* and *both* as pronouns of totality, since *all* and *both* are unmistakable totals, referring to acts of structural thought, whereas *each* and *every* are wholly or partly distributive.

The chapter on gender calls for no comment. In the field of number the introduction of the term *countables* for things capable of pluralization is a lucky hit, as is also the term *mass-words* for things uncountable. Exceptions to the rules come in for a good deal of notice, and the English way of individualizing mass-words is duly discussed. The term *generic* appears once more in the discussion of number in connection with such generalizing statements as *man is mortal, a cat has nine lives, the dog is vigilant, dogs are vigilant*, and *the English are fond of out-door sports*, where language uses now the singular, now the plural, now a definite and now an indefinite form to express ideas about a whole species or class.

The chapter on the degrees of comparison contains one or two statements that are altogether out of the beaten tracks of logic. In 22.6₄ Jespersen asserts that the comparative does not mean a higher degree of the quality in question than the positive does in itself: "*Peter is older than John* does not imply that Peter is old, and the comparative may therefore really indicate a lesser degree than the positive would in *Peter is old*. Nor does it, of course, say anything about John's being old — if this is meant, we say *Peter is still older than John*."

In 22.7₁ the superlative is said not to "indicate a higher degree than the comparative, but really states the same degree, only looked at from a different point of view."

There is in these statements a curious confusion of the relative and absolute values of the word "old". John, if nine years of age, is certainly not considered old, no more than Peter is when the latter happens to be ten. Yet both their ages are countable in units of time, and then Peter in the

absolute sense scores a higher degree of age than John. Besides John and Peter may be 89 and 90 respectively and would both be considered old in the relative sense of the term.

As regards the superlative the case is no different. Whenever an adjective represents an attribute of time, space or quantity, its degrees are ultimately reducible to number. Hence though both the comparative and the superlative refer to the same idea, no amount of "looking at from different points of view" can wash out their numerical difference.

Limited superlatives are said to occur in collocations like *the next best*, *the third longest*, etc.; *latent* comparison is seen in sentences of the type *this is too good to be true* and *I prefer claret to sherry*. Latin comparatives and all other features of comparison are duly discussed in this highly interesting chapter.

The first new term to face the reader in the chapter on *tense* is the term *tense-phrases*, suggested for the perfect and pluperfect. The future tenses are not allowed a special chapter but are dealt with in chapter 25 under the heading *Will and Shall*. *Inclusive Present* is the name suggested for what Sweet calls the incomplete perfect; *before-past* denotes what Sweet calls *pre-past*. The traditional *present* and *past participles*, on account of the difficulty of assigning them to any definite time are styled as *first* and *second*, to which a third is added, viz. the *perfect part.*, consisting of *having* + *second p.* As the traditional perfect tenses are called *tense-phrases*, one is tempted to ask why a junction of a first and second participle should thus yield a *perfect*, and whether consistency does not require the name "phrase" here too. Besides, it is open to query whether *first* and *second* are better determinants for participles than *present* and *past*.

Conclusive verbs denote what other grammarians have called terminative or perfective verbs; *imaginative tenses* express shades of modality; the *perfect infinitive of imagination* is seen in sentences of the kind *It would have been wiser to have left it unsaid* (= if you had left it unsaid).

Chapters 25 and 26 contain a very good exposition of the shall-and-will case, the terror of foreign learners. No new terms are added to the traditional nomenclature beyond the terms *Before-past*, *After-past* and *Before-future* as sub-divisions of the past and future tenses. The statement in 25.8, that "the English language to express the three distinct ideas of volition, obligation and futurity possesses only two auxiliaries" finds its necessary complement in Chapter 33 on the Infinitive, where the volitional functions of *to be to*, *to have to*, *must* and *ought to* are discussed.

Moods — not a big subject in present-day English when looked at from the inflectional angle only — are dismissed in three pages and call for no comment. Yet I cannot help thinking that the ineradicable distinction of fact and non-fact, as Sweet has put it, makes a better starting-point for the discussion of modal phenomena than the formal point of view adopted by Jespersen. Mental activity is nowhere more evident than in the sphere of modality, the sphere of Jespersen's "imaginary" tenses, for in normal speech "imagination" always precedes utterance.

The sections on affirmation, negation and question deal with the manifold ways in which these mental activities are expressed in language, full justice being done to the external part, the formal part. In trying, however, to establish a difference between the mathematical and linguistic meaning of the terms *positive* and *negative* Jespersen's argumentation is fallacious. "Though the terms *positive* and *negative*", he says, "are used both in mathematics and in grammar, their meaning is not the same; in mathematics —4 means a point as much below 0 as +4 is above 0. In language, on the other hand, a negative changes a term into the contradictory term: *smokers* and *non-smokers* together comprise everybody; *he will come* and *he will not come* exhaust all possibilities, and *not happy* means *anything but happy*."

It will be seen that in the second member of the statement the values +4 and —4 are substituted for the terms *positive* and *negative* in the first, for which there is no warrant. For the combinations +4 and —4 are not the real items of comparison with the terms *positive* and *negative*, but the symbols + and — by themselves, which function respectively as positive and negative adjuncts to the symbol 4, thus creating two varieties of *four*, which in Algebra comprise all possibilities of "fourness," just as in ordinary language *smokers* and *non-smokers* exhaust all smoking possibilities about persons. As no man can be both a smoker and a non-smoker, so no four can be both plus and minus.

There lurks another danger in Jespersen's argument. It does not do to refuse the name of language to mathematical terminology. Whatever symbols may be employed, they are as much "language" as other mediums of thought and communication.

The further aspects of negation, the effect of two negatives applied to the same word, the heaping up of negatives in vulgar speech, the cases of weakened and implied negation, would have gone far enough to show that in these as in other matters language and logic are often at variance, so that the mental aspect of negation often differs from the formal or expressional.

The chapters 29 and 30 on dependent nexuses and nexus-substantives I count among the most interesting sections of the book. As stated above the term nexus is meant to connote every form of logical combination between primaries and their adnexes. Adnexes therefore show a great variety of form from simple predicative adjectives and nouns to prepositional phrases (as in "Her friends held her of *little account*"), participles, gerunds and infinitives. It follows that dependent nexuses comprise every form of dependent clause or clause-equivalent, hence also the traditional nominative absolute, where the simple nexus of a noun and a participle functions as a "tertiary" or adverb-clause.

The so-called nominal constructions also belong here. "A dependent nexus is very often expressed by means of a substantive. We have two kinds of nexus-substantives. In the first an adjective or a substantive is at the basis as a predicative; *cleverness* = 'being clever', *wisdom* = 'being wise', and similarly *pride*, *ease*, *constancy*, *friendship*, *chaplaincy*, *heroism*, etc.

In the second kind a verb is at the basis: *arrival* = 'the act of arriving', *belief*, *existence*, *sleep*, *fight*, *examination*, *collision*, *judgment*, etc.

These latter are often called 'action-nouns', but some of our examples have already shown that this name is not quite appropriate, as many verbal ideas do not indicate any action."

The appropriate use of abstract nouns as clause-equivalents (closely allied to the use of gerunds), often adds to the vigour and dignity of style. There can be no doubt that in *the doctor's quick arrival* a complicated idea is expressed "in a short and handy way". Yet it is doubtful whether in *Pride goes before a fall* we are justified in looking upon *pride* as a nexus-word having for its "primary" the generic pronoun. I rather believe *pride* to be a "junction", a mental structure of combinative thought activity, or just an abstract noun, not differing intrinsically from such abstract nouns as *time* in *Time is money*. Cf. also *Life is but an empty dream*, in which *empty* and *dream* enter into a junction, with little or nothing of activity remaining in *dream*. Or, better still, *He sold his captaincy*, which does not bear expansion into *he sold his being a captain*.

Jespersen's example: "The doctor's extremely quick arrival and uncommonly careful examination of the patient brought about her very speedy recovery" looks like having been coined to illustrate a point rather than to prove it. Some of the other examples make a better show, as for example *Your praise encouraged him*. *He is full of your praises*. *We must come to his assistance*.

From abstract nouns to gerunds is but one step, the gerund being "a hybrid between subst. and verb". Gerundial nexuses (gerund-clauses) have been so often discussed that it would be little short of a miracle if anything new were discovered about them. Suffice it to say that all the paraphernalia of the gerund are duly dealt with. So are, in Chapter 32, the manifold uses of the Infinitive.

Under the object-infinitives (strange to say for a grammar that claims to be modern and generally proves its claim!) are also included the combinations of *can*, *may*, *must*, *will*, *shall*, *do* with "bare" infinitives, and the collocations *had better*, *had sooner*, *had as soon*, and the obsolete *had liefer*, *had as lief*. (A similar assertion, by the way, is met with in Onions's Advanced English Syntax). As most of these words have been worn down to mere modifying particles with no more independence than the endings of inflectional languages, it seems rather absurd to associate them with verbs as their objects. In the case of *shall*, which, when an auxiliary of the plain future, refers to time only, such a combination is a logical impossibility. And how about *can* in *Everybody knows how trying children can be*? One cannot conceive how the existential verb can be brought into anything like an object relation to *can*!

It may also be doubted whether infinitives and dependent clauses can be governed by prepositions, as Jespersen assumes in 32.19 and 33. I expect the majority of his readers will doubt whether a preposition, innocent of real or imaginary activity as it is, should be capable of governing an

object at all. It is rather the other way about. It is the noun-idea in its diversified relations that governs the preposition, just as in inflectional languages it governs its endings.

In justice to Jespersen I ought to add that the only prep. he mentions as coming in for this relation with infinitives is *about*, as in *He was about to retire*. But even here the real unit of thought is *to be about*, constituting an auxiliary phrase of the future tense.

The latter-day development of *to be* + *to do* in *Would that be anything to do with the war*, is explained as a contamination of *is* and *has* in phrases like *It's nothing to do with his health*, 's being interpreted as *is*.

The acc. + inf. construction, being treated as a nexus, comes in for what looks like a very modest amount of space. Here, if anywhere, Jespersen severs all connection with Latin grammar traditions. There are none of the orthodox groupings, only a summary being given of the chief types of verb admitting of the construction. Via the infinitive nexuses preceded by prepositions as in "She can hardly prevail *upon him to eat*", the reader is led on to the *for* + obj. + inf. constructions, and from these to what is commonly called the nominative + infin. construction, in which the subject plus an inf. is itself the subject of the main verb, as in *He is supposed to be honest*, which is logically equivalent to *He to be honest is supposed*.

This highly interesting chapter is concluded with a few remarks on the split infinitive. "The name is misleading", says Jespersen, for the preposition *to* no more belongs to the infinitive as a necessary part of it, than the definite article belongs to the substantive, and no one would think of calling 'the good man' a split substantive."

I doubt whether the two cases are on a par, adjectives + nouns forming junctions of a much more solid kind than adverbs + infinitives, as appears from the fact that the adverb can move about the infinitive much more freely than adjectives about nouns. But let that be. The split infinitives have found a footing in English syntax and that's that. "Split infinitives are preferable to ambiguity", says H. W. Fowler in his *Dict. of Mod. Eng. Usage*.

Chapters 33, 34 and 35 deal with clauses as primaries, secondaries and tertiaries. The term *content-clause* is suggested as a substitute for noun-clause. No great improvement, I fear, and its definition is ambiguous. If "a content-clause is a cl. containing a statement which is not a sentence by itself, but is made part of a sentence", it may also be an adj. or an adverb-clause.

There is further a discussion of the cases where the conj. *that* is commonly said to have been omitted. It would of course be wrong to imagine that a conj., when non-existent, should have been omitted. The cases where the use of *that* is desirable are enumerated in 33.15. Interrog. clauses and those of the type "Who steals my purse ..." can also function as primaries. But the term *condensed rel. pron.* can find no favour in Jespersen's sight. "It would not do to say that *who* stands for *he who*, and that *he* is the

subject of (the verb in) the main clause, and *who* that of the relative clause, for the supposition of an ellipsis of *he* is quite gratuitous — ..."

Formally speaking there is, indeed, no *he*. But on the semantic side of *who* in the above function there is a demonstrative element, as well as in *He laughs at scars who never felt a wound*. Why not acknowledge this semantic being, this invisible yet imaginable element? There is as much justification in calling *who* a condensed or concentrated relative pronoun as there is in Jespersen's calling a nexus-substantive "a nexus concentrated into one word" (*Linguistica*, p. 310), or in marshalling the "generic person" to fill up the gap in his nexus-argument when discussing the subject of infinitives and gerunds.

The term *contact-clause* is not a bad suggestion for syntactically unconnected combinations of the type *the girls he sees*. Jespersen's standpoint as regards the *that*-controversy appears from the statement: "It is customary to call the relative (connecting) word *that* a pronoun, but it would be more correct to term it a relative conjunction or particle."

The section on rel. clauses is a very elaborate one, the use of preps. with rels., the connectives *as* and *but*, and many irregularities being all discussed. The only thing one would like Jespersen to have included is the use of a rel. pron. governed by an infinitive or gerund at the end of a clause, as in *The kiss that she expired in giving* (Par. and the Peri), which is rather puzzling for foreigners.

The last chapter of the book deals with adverb or tertiary clauses. They embrace adverbial relations of place, time, contrast (introduced by *whereas*), manner, comparison, cause, purpose, result, condition, restriction (*He has never been here that I know, as far as I know*), concession, indifference (introduced by *whether ... or, no matter what, whatever, or whoever*, or of the type *Go where he will, Try as he would*), and parallelism (*the ... the, according as, in proportion as*), a few notes being added on "amorphous" clauses containing only an introductory word and a predicative, as in *Don't speak, until spoken to*.

In *Essentials of English Grammar* an honest attempt is made to embody the principles of present-day linguistics as partly carried out by Jespersen in *The Philosophy of Grammar* and in *A Modern English Grammar*. Yet he is not a modernist *à tort et à travers*, and I think he was wise in not breaking altogether with the achievements of our predecessors. Leave well alone. "Reformism" is apt to rush from one dogmatism into another, and infant-mortality is sadly in evidence amongst scientific theories.

As regards his own principles, Jespersen declares in Ch. I that "language is nothing but a set of human habits, the purpose of which is to give expression to thoughts and feelings, and especially to impart them to others." He would therefore seem to be on the mentalist side, tracing syntactical phenomena to mental processes as their first causes. Sometimes we found him halting between mentalism and positivism, however. But then "As with other habits, it is not to be expected that they should be perfectly

'consistent" (p. 16). His occasional leaning towards positivism (or naturalism) explains why most of the shortcomings we noticed were on the theoretical side. Those who wish to know more about Jespersen's linguistic principles I would refer to *A System of Grammar* (Allen & Unwin Ltd., 2s.) or to the larger publications *The Philosophy of Grammar and Language, its Nature, Development and Origin*. *A System of Grammar* contains a detailed account (with a good deal of controversial argument) of the fundamental ideas underlying *Essentials* as it is.

The book is kept on inductive lines and the examples, with very few exceptions, are clear and to the point. Those who take the trouble to master Jespersen's terminology, which is not a big order, will find their labour amply rewarded. The balance of opinion is decidedly in favour of the book. And though not intended for foreign students, it reveals an undercurrent of comparison with other languages, so that those syntactical phenomena which are of more importance for foreign than for English students come in for more consideration than is usually accorded to them by native grammarians.

As regards phonetics, chapters II-VI contain a very readable synopsis of English sounds, including just enough of their historical evolutions to enable the learner to understand the great divergence between Modern English speech and its spelling. The term "phoneme", by the way, is conspicuous by its absence.

Time alone can tell how much of Jespersen's method and terminology will find favour with posterity. The first reception of the book promises well for the future. The first edition appeared in 1933, the fourth impression in 1938.

Groningen.

H. MULDER.

[Bibliography in the next issue]

Iago and the Problem of Time

For jealousy is the rage of a man: therefore
he will not spare in the day of vengeance.
Proverbs, VI. 34.

The purpose of this essay is to answer two questions concerning *Othello*:

- I. Is double time necessary?
- II. What, exactly, was Iago's accusation against Desdemona?

The ghost of Double Time has not yet been effectively laid. The theory was first elaborated by Christopher North¹, but Bradley's summary² is conveniently brief:

... its essence is the notion that Shakespeare wanted to produce on the spectator (for he did not aim at readers) two impressions. He wanted the spectator to feel a passionate and vehement haste in the action; but he also wanted him to feel that the action was fairly probable. Consciously or unconsciously he used Short Time ... for the first purpose, and Long Time ... for the second. The spectator is affected in the required manner by both, 'though without distinctly noticing the indications of the two schemes. (p. 426).

In dealing with an artist of Shakespeare's quality it is dangerous to assume that he did anything 'unconsciously', while to suggest that he 'consciously' employed a device such as Double Time is to infer that he deliberately constructed a play that, in a vital matter, is inconsistent with itself. To put the matter bluntly, the theory is absurd.

The only time-scheme that is acceptable is the short time-scheme. Here is a time-table of the play, differing in no essential from that given by Bradley, *loc. cit.* pp. 423-4:

VENICE.

Act. I.	Sc. i.	Brabantio roused.	}	The first night.
	ii.	At the Sagittary.		
	iii.	At the Senate.		

[The Voyage to Cyprus]

CYPRUS.

Act. II.	Sc. i.	Arrival at Cyprus.	}	Sat. afternoon.
	ii.	The herald.		Sat. night.
	iii.	The brawl.		

¹ *Blackwood's Magazine*, November, 1849, April and May, 1850, and the *Transactions of the New Shakespeare Association*, 1875-76, 1877-79.

² A. C. Bradley, *Shakespearian Tragedy*, 2nd ed.; see Note I on 'The Duration of the Action in *Othello*', pp. 423-429.

Act. III. Sc. i.	Cassio's visit.	}	Sunday morning.
ii.	Othello at work.		
iii.	Cassio's interview..		
	temptation.. oaths.		
iv.	The handkerchief.	}	Sunday evening before supper.
Act. IV. Sc. i.	Temptation.. Bianca..		
ii.	Ambassadors.		
iii.	Brothel.		
iv.	'Willow, willow, .	}	Sunday evening after supper.
Act. V. Sc. i.	The street murders.		
ii.	The murder of Desdemona..		
	conclusion.		

The naming of the days depends upon Desdemona's plea for Cassio's reinstatement :

*Des.*³ Shall't be to-night at supper ?
Oth. No, not to-night.
Des. To-morrow dinner, then ?
Oth. I shall not dine at home ;
I meet the captains at the citadel.
Des. Why, then, to-morrow night ; or Tuesday morn ;
On Tuesday noon, or night ; on Wednesday morn : ...
(III. iii. 57-61).

It would seem that this time-scheme is, as Bradley asserts, "in flat contradiction with a large number of time-indications in the play itself" (p. 425). In fact, however, this is not so.

One of these time-indications is Iago's statement in his story of the night he spent with Cassio :

... I lay with Cassio *lately* ; ... (III. iii. 413).

As Bradley remarks, according to Short Time, Iago and Cassio "had only spent one night in Cyprus, and we are expressly told that Cassio never went to bed on that night" (425). But surely Iago's story refers to some actual or invented occasion before the departure from Venice. The voyage from Venice to Cyprus would only have taken a few days (Iago and Cassio were in different ships), so that Cassio's remark that the arrival of Desdemona and Iago

... anticipates our thoughts
A se'nnight's speed. ... (II. i. 75-6).

suggests that Desdemona, instead of delaying her departure from Venice for a week or more after Othello's, as he and Cassio had expected, actually left only a day or two later at the most. They, who set sail together and before Desdemona, were delayed and parted by a "foul and violent tempest". Yet, although the conditions were presumably far from perfect,

Tempest themselves, high seas, and howling winds

³ Quotations throughout are from the *Globe Edition*.

had so far abated when Desdemona left Venice, that her ship enjoyed "most favourable and happy speed", and she actually landed in Cyprus before Othello. The details are plain enough but in themselves unimportant. What is essential in interpreting Iago's *lately* is that the voyage was not a long one, and that, hence, it is neither impossible nor improbable that the word refers to a real or imagined occasion in Venice before the voyage. Therefore the word is in itself no contradiction of the Short Time scheme.

The practical certainty that Iago's story is a lie is no real difficulty. It was a credible lie: Othello believed it. That is all the more reason for adopting the most plausible interpretation of *lately* that we can find.

In view of this, even apart from the obvious time-scheme of the play, Short Time, it seems reasonable to interpret *lately* as referring to some supposed occasion before the opening of the play and in Venice.

Similarly with Bianca's "seven days and nights" (III. iv. 173). There is no reason to suppose that the voyage took more than a week. Bianca is a 'hussif', a prostitute, a camp-follower, who has crossed from Venice probably in Cassio's ship⁴. Her acquaintance with him is obviously not new. The easiest view of the meaning of her speech in this scene (III. iv.) is that, though Cassio saw her before leaving Venice, he had no time for her on the voyage and, in this scene, she is taking the first opportunity, after making necessary arrangements for her stay in Cyprus, of seeking him out and communicating her whereabouts to him. Indeed, if my interpretation of Iago's *lately* be allowed as reasonable and valid in itself, then Bianca's precise arithmetic about Cassio's neglect comes as proof that the maximum time that we can imagine the voyage to have taken is one week. The probabilities are that it was less.

It might be asked if there is any proof that Cassio knew Bianca in Venice. One has only to remember the account Cassio gives of a meeting with her :

I was the other day talking on the sea-bank with certain Venetians ; ...
(IV. i. 137-8).

This, by reason of the phrase, 'the other day', must refer to an incident in Venice, since he has only been in Cyprus about twenty-four hours. Therefore Bianca was known to Cassio in Venice.

But one point to notice is that these last two time-indications not only both concern Bianca, but also occur in the text *after the one place at which it has been held possible to make a break*, namely, between III. iii. and III. iv. If this break is shown to be impossible, then it seems to me that my conclusions are unassailable.

⁴ "In Flanders, each soldier was supposed to have "his dainty Doxy" ...; and as Clowes remarks in the *Royal Navy*, the Spaniards on the holy crusade of the Armada had to make special provision against harlots on ship-board, as well as swearing and duelling. ... he [Cassio] seems merely to have accepted the moral conventions of his profession and his age." See J. W. Draper, *Captain General Othello, Anglia*, LV p. 296, esp., pp. 304-5.

This break was suggested by Fleay and has been admirably summarised by Bradley, *loc. cit.* p. 424:

The only *possible* place, it will be seen, where time can elapse is between III. iii. and III. iv. And here Mr. Fleay would imagine a gap of at least a week. The reader will find that this supposition involves the following results. (a) Desdemona has allowed at least a week to elapse without telling Cassio that she has interceded for him. (b) Othello, after being convinced of her guilt, after resolving to kill her, and after ordering Iago to kill Cassio within three days, has allowed at least a week to elapse without even questioning her about the handkerchief, and has so behaved during all this time that she is totally unconscious of any change in his feelings. (c) Desdemona, who reserves the handkerchief evermore about her to kiss and talk to (III. iii. 295), has lost it for at least a week before she is conscious of the loss. (d) Iago has waited at least a week to leave the handkerchief in Cassio's chamber; for Cassio has evidently only just found it, and wants the work on it copied before the owner makes inquiries for it. These are all gross absurdities. It is certain that only a short time, most probably not even a night, elapses between III. iii. and III. iv.

There is small need to seek further arguments against Fleay's suggestion.

Bradley admits that possibly one night may have elapsed. This is, I believe, an error. There are two reasons, however, neither entirely vain, for supposing that the lapse of time, if it indeed does occur, is precisely one night. The first is this: since at the beginning of Act III the Clown is associated with early morning and the start of a new day, might we not infer that his second and only other appearance also indicates that it is morning? The second lies in Iago's reference to the stars at the end of III. iii.:

Witness, you ever-burning lights above!

Does this mean that at the end of III. iii. it is night? The reply to this is that, if Iago recognised that the stars were "ever-burning", he was just as likely to call them to witness by day as by night. And with this point removed the suggestion as to the significance of the Clown is not strong ground on which to postulate that Othello, whose line,

Well, my good lady. [*Aside*] O, hardness to dissemble! —

is the first he speaks in III. iv., succeeded in passing a night with Desdemona in such a way that she could meet Emilia's question, "Is he not jealous?" with the complete confidence and finality of

Who, he? I think the sun where he was born
Drew all such humours from him.

(III. iv. 30-1).

The function of the Clown at this point is, in fact, identical with that of the Porter in *Macbeth*: to provide a break and change of mood between a highly dramatic scene, the murder, the temptation, and a slightly less intense scene, the discovery of the murder, the demand for the handkerchief. In short, when we have done our utmost, we cannot weaken the conclusion that the action throughout III. iii. and III. iv. is almost

continuous and that it takes place in the late morning or early afternoon of Sunday, Desdemona's last day alive.

To tabulate the argument :

- (i). The main long-time indications we have to deal with are
 - a). III. iii. 413. "I lay with Cassio lately".
 - b). III. iv. 173. "seven days and nights".
 - c). IV. i. 137-8. "the other day talking on the sea-bank with certain Venetians".
- (ii). None of these is insuperable.
- (iii). Bradley has argued sufficiently against any break between III. iii. and IV. i.
- (iv.) The possibility of a long break anywhere between II. i. (the arrival) and III. iii. is non-existent.

Thus I suggest :

- (a). that this proposed break between III. iii. and IV. i. is impossible ;
- (b). that no earlier break in the action other than the voyage is defensible ; and
- (c). that the supposed long-time indications demonstrably refer to incidents before Othello left Venice.

"Long Time" and "Double Time" are unnecessary, and the obvious time-scheme, "Short Time", stands firm.⁵

Our next task is to consider the reason why the critics have been so anxious to find a break in the action of the play after the scene is transferred to Cyprus.

We have considered all the Long Time indications listed by Bradley (*loc. cit.* p. 425) except one which he states thus :

The ground on which Iago builds throughout is the probability of Desdemona's having got tired of the Moor; she is accused of having repeatedly committed adultery with Cassio (*e.g.* V. ii. 210); these facts and a great many others, such as Othello's language in III. iii. 338 ff. are utterly absurd on the supposition that he murders his wife within a day or two of the night when he consummated his marriage.

In other words, we are now faced with our second main problem :

What, *exactly*, was Iago's accusation against Desdemona ?

⁵ On all this section see that part of the Appendix of the *Furness Variorum Edition* headed 'The Duration of the Action', pp. 358-372. It is there noted that Daniel (*Time Analysis of the Plays, New Shakes. Soc. Trans.*, 1877-79) argues for Long Time before the voyage to Cyprus, but then goes on to insist that Long Time after II. i. is necessary for 'probability'.

It must, it would seem, be either fornication, or, as is more commonly held, adultery. To both proposals there are apparently insuperable difficulties.

Unless — and we have seen it is impossible — some break in the action after the beginning of Act. II can be clearly demonstrated, there can be no question of adultery, since there is no time in which it may be supposed to have occurred even once between the accused pair. Certainly there is no opportunity for the numerous occasions that Iago suggests and Othello plainly imagines. Equally it cannot be a matter of fornication, since anyone who believes that it was will be compelled also to admit that though Othello found Desdemona a virgin on the night of his arrival in Cyprus, yet on the very next morning he was prepared to give ear and credence to suggestions that she was not. As Bradley puts it, "Othello was not an absolute idiot". There is also this fact: neither the word *fornication*, nor the word *adultery*, nor any word formed from either, occurs in the whole length of *Othello* — which renders it doubtful if Desdemona's supposed crime qualifies precisely for either category. Plainly the only course open is to reconsider each statement of the accusation made against Desdemona by Iago, and later, as the play proceeds, by Othello himself. It is evident that the place where the acts of unchastity were supposed to occur is important: if at Cyprus, we might suppose the accusation to be adultery; if at Venice, fornication. The quotations which follow should each be considered in relation to this question, "Is this a reference to fornication or adultery, to Cyprus or Venice?"

Iago. Did Michael Cassio, when you woo'd my lady,
Know of your love? (III. iii. 96-7).

Iago. I did not think he had been acquainted with her.

Oth. O, yes; and went between us very oft.

Iago. Indeed! (III. iii. 99-101).

Oth. ... when I told thee he was of my counsel

In my whole course of wooing, thou criest 'Indeed!'

(III. iii. 111-112).

Iago. ... that cuckold lives in bliss

Who, certain of his fate, loves not his wronger; ...

(III. iii. 167-8).

Oth. Nor from my own weak merits will I draw

The smallest fear or doubt of her revolt;

(III. iii. 187-8).

Iago. In Venice they do let heaven see the pranks

They dare not show their husbands; ...

(III. iii. 202-3).

Iago. ... though I may fear

Her will, recoiling to her better judgment,

May fail to match you with her country forms

And happily repent.

(III. iii. 235-8).

Oth. ... O curse of marriage,

That we can call these delicate creatures ours

And not their appetites! ...

(III. iii. 268-270).

Oth. ... Ha! Ha! false to me?

(III. iii. 333).

- Oth.* What sense had I of her stol'n hours of lust?
 I saw't not, thought it not, it harm'd not me:
 I slept the next night well, was free and merry;
 I found not Cassio's kisses on her lips: ... (III. iii. 338-341).
- Iago.* (*supposedly reporting Cassio*)
 ... 'Cursed fate that gave thee to the Moor!'
- Oth.* O monstrous! monstrous!
- Iago.* Nay, this was but his dream.
- Oth.* But this denoted a *foregone conclusion*: ... (III. iii. 426-428).
- Iago.* For I will make him tell the tale anew,
 Where, how, *how oft*, *how long ago*, and when
 He hath, and is again to cope your wife: ... (IV. i. 85-8).
- Oth.* I will chop her into messes: *cuckold* me! (IV. i. 211):
- Oth.* I took you for *that cunning whore of Venice*
That married with Othello. (IV. ii. 89-90).
- Emil.* What place? what time? what form? what likelihood?
 (IV. ii. 138).
- Oth.* She turn'd to folly, and she was a whore. (V. ii. 132).
- Emil.* ... she was false to wedlock?
- Oth.* Ay, with Cassio. (V. ii. 140-1).

From this evidence the following conclusions can be drawn:

- THAT** although some of the quotations might be held to suggest the accusation was one of fornication these are in themselves insufficient basis for any attempt to argue that the accusation was in fact fornication, being outweighed by the bulk of the evidence in favour of adultery, and they are not incompatible with the inevitable conclusion
- THAT** the majority of these extracts seem, beyond all possible doubt, references to an accusation of adultery⁶, and
- THAT** placed together in this way the accusation and discussion of it do not constitute merely a vague hint of unchastity between Cassio and Desdemona either before or after her marriage, but
- THAT** they are deliberately linked to that period of Othello's relations with her immediately before the play opens, Othello's 'courtship'. Stress is laid upon the character she displayed *then* in deceiving her father and *then* in her 'unnatural' love for a coloured man and upon the imputation of lasciviousness in Venetian women.

In other words, while the accusation seems almost certainly one of adultery, which would appear utterly incompatible with a time-scheme allowing no loop-hole whatever for unchastity after the arrival in Cyprus, yet equally plainly there is striking agreement in so much as the acts of

⁶ Cf. Bradley, *loc. cit.* p. 426, "Iago's accusation is uniformly one of adultery". The most important fact about it is that Othello believed it.

unchastity are never said to have occurred in Cyprus, but are by strongest implication associated with the period before the voyage, with Othello's 'courtship', with Venice.

This is the crux of the matter. Bradley frankly regarded the whole affair as an impasse. From it he could perceive only one escape: "Possibly," he says, "possibly the play has been tampered with."

It is a very feeble suggestion. There is no proof of such tampering, and to assume that it has taken place would be to invalidate Bradley's own admirable assertion that "*Othello* is ... the most masterly of the tragedies in point of construction" (*loc. cit.* p. 177), since it is in a vital matter of construction that this tampering is supposed to have had direst effect. The text of *Othello* stands upon surer foundation than that of almost any other play of Shakespeare's. We have the quarto entered in the Stationer's Register on October 6, 1621, publishing the play in 1622, "As it hath beene diuerse times acted at the Globe, and at the Black Friars, by his Maiesties Seruants" and the Folio version, together with other plays that Heminge and Condell claim to have printed from Shakespeare's 'papers', "absolute in their numbers, as he conceived them". The two versions, in the opinion of Sir E. K. Chambers, "clearly rest upon substantially the same original". They are at variance on no vital point. It is impossible to imagine that a text with such credentials should be faulty to the extent we should have to assume to escape our present difficulty.

Fortunately salvation depends upon no such assumption. All our difficulties are overcome, many points made clearer and no problems raised if we can find reason to believe that Othello and Desdemona entered upon and consummated a contract marriage some time before the play opens. And reasons are not far to seek.

The importance of contract marriages in Shakespeare's day has been emphasised by Dr. J. S. Smart in *Shakespeare: Truth and Tradition*, and authentic examples from every-day life have been published by Professor Sisson in *Lost Plays of Shakespeare's Age*. The formular of such marriages is well understood. The parties plighted troth before witnesses. Rings were exchanged. The groom gave the bride a small sum of money or other token. Consummation could and often did follow. The whole matter is discussed and explained by a legal contemporary of Shakespeare, one Henry Swinburne,⁷ whose seventeenth century editor summarises thus:

... .. the Rules concerning SPOUSALS are for the most part as well applicable to MARRIAGE as them, and ... there is no difference in Substance betwixt SPOUSALS DE PRÆSENTI (which make up the principal part of this book) and MATRIMONY,

⁷ Referred to by Smart, *loc. cit.*, p. 76. Henry Swinburne, *A Treatise of Spousals or Matrimonial Contracts, etc.*, London, 1686. (Second Edition, 1711). This work was published posthumously. Swinburne's other book, *A briefe Treatise of Testaments and last wills, etc.*, was published by J. Windet at London, 1590-1591. The date of the colophon is 1591. Both books are available in the British Museum.

only the Publick Office, and a greater Solemnity of the Act, together with the Benediction of the Minister, are by law requisite to compleat the Matrimony, before it be capable of those Legal Effects of Dower and Legitimation of Issue. But in *FORO CONSCIENTIÆ* they are as much Man and Wife, as if all Legal Requisites and Solemnities had been performed. Nay, as to some Legal Effects also, a Contract *DE PRÆSENTI* has the same force that a lawful Marriage has; for the contract is indissoluble so long as the Parties live; and if either Party shall after such Contract attempt to marry elsewhere, that Marriage is null and void *RATIONE PRÆ CONTRACTUS*, as much as if the Parties contracting had been lawfully married together; and the Parties marrying elsewhere, after such contract made, are to be Divorced, and the Persons contracting may by course of Law be compelled to Solemnise Matrimony according to the Rites and Ceremonies of the Church. ...

Such was contract marriage. Can it help in the solution of the main problems of *Othello*, and, what is infinitely more important, does it provide the truth about *Othello*?

It is well to be frank. Nowhere in the whole five acts of the play is any such thing as contract marriage mentioned. Nowhere in the play is the situation expounded explicitly point by point in terms of a contract marriage. To a demand for verbal proof I cannot quote a single reference. But I can and do reply that a contract marriage is at all points *implicit* in the play, it is there for all to see, it needs no verbal proof. And if this contention must be defended, then I have a triple line of defence:

- I. The suggestion of contract marriage solves all existing difficulties;
- II. It raises no new ones;
- III. It makes our understanding of the plot more vivid.

We have *Othello's* account of his courtship of *Desdemona*. It concludes with her modest but unambiguous confession of love which he returned.

Their position was a difficult one. She was the only child of a wealthy and respected senator of Venice, he a middle-aged soldier of fortune, a servant of that body to which it was her father's greatest honour to belong, a native of Africa. That her father would consent to their marriage was impossible. But they were passionate people, theirs was a passionate age. They entered upon a contract marriage.

In this *Cassio* was their helper. It is plain from his own account (I. iii. 128-170) that *Othello* did not need *Cassio's* aid in wooing *Desdemona*,⁸ but he did need a thoroughly trust-worthy friend to escort her to his lodging ("my chamber", IV, i. 146), one whose accompanying of her would, and did, "seel her father's eyes". The secret was too precious to be committed to any servant. Only a friend, honourable as *Cassio*, could be trusted with it.

⁸ *Othello* tells *Iago* that *Cassio* knew of their love "from first to last", and also that he "went between [them] very oft" (III. iii. 94-100). We cannot expect *Othello* to be more explicit than that, even to honest *Iago*.

Naturally this move did not lessen but rather increased their difficulties. Brabantio was anxious to see his daughter settled and she was fair enough and rich enough to be the aim of many suitors (I. ii. 66-68). Elopement or confession would inevitably have come before long. Imagine, then, the position when Othello learned, confidentially no doubt, that the Turkish attack was being transferred to the ill-garrisoned Cyprus and that he who had fought there before was certainly the man the Senate would turn to in their necessity. He would have to leave Venice, leave Desdemona, leave his wife. It would not be the usual parting of a soldier-husband. He would leave her at the mercy of her father's compulsion to marry any suitor who was lucky enough to gain his especial favour, and we know that a father in those days did not easily accept a daughter's refusal in such matters. Brabantio himself comments on his own leniency (I. iii. 195-8). She would *have* to accompany Othello. There was no other way. They must elope.

No doubt Othello knew something of the probable course of events. He knew the Senate would pick upon him, he had already chosen his lieutenant. If he could arrange for Desdemona to escape the moment he was appointed, he might hope to get her aboard and leave Venice suddenly before she had been missed. This was the plan he evidently pursued.

But he hesitated to call further upon Cassio's generosity. He therefore employed his own servant (can we doubt the identity of the gondolier?) in the business, Iago.

Now we, who know the play, know very well the temper of that servant. We know that he had at least one grievance against Othello: he had expected the lieutenantcy, he had been overlooked. We can imagine how, when Othello gave him his instructions for the abduction of Desdemona, the whole plot had flashed upon him.⁹ *That* was why Cassio, the 'mere arithmetician', had found favour with his master, *that* was why he, of whom Othello's eyes

... had seen the proof
At Rhodes, at Cyprus and on other grounds
Christian and heathen, ...

(I. i. 27-9).

was asked to be content to serve only as "his Moorship's ancient", and why the Moor had "already chose" his officer. Iago's mind worked with its customary speed. He carried out his instructions, paraded as a gondolier and filched Desdemona to the Sagittary. And then, when all was done, he betrayed the secret to her most persistent wooer, a rich and noble half-wit, Roderigo. Iago knew very well that this first move would effect very little:

⁹ Knowing Othello's opinion of Iago's honesty, there is no reason to suppose that he used any special reticence in giving him his instructions, in referring to what was then a *fait accompli*.

... the state,
 However this may gall him with some check,
 Cannot with safety cast him, for he's embark'd
 With such loud reason to the Cyprus wars,
 Which even now stand in act, that, for their souls,
 Another of his fathom they have none,
 To lead their business: ...

But he had poisoned Othello's delight, won over the wealthy Roderigo, and so begun his revenge upon that unhappy trio whose plotting had carelessly left him, doubtless no cautious man with money,

... belee'd and calmed
 By debtor and creditor: ...¹⁰

The position at the outset is that while Iago knew of Cassio's part in Othello's affairs, Cassio knew nothing of Iago's knowledge:

Iago. ... he to-night hath boarded a land carack:
 If it prove lawful prize, he's made for ever.
Cas. I do not understand.
Iago. He's married.
Cas. To who?

Cassio is on his guard. Iago did not reply himself. Events soon answered for him.

If we allow the argument thus far, we can already count our gains. In the first place, the reason for Cassio's appointment is stronger and clearer than ever before. We can see this fact at work in Othello's mind much later in IV. i. 213 when he exclaims, "With mine officer!" It is on that thought that he chooses his revenge, for he continues at once, "Get me some poison, Iago; this night: ..." It is the final bitterness of a double trust doubly betrayed that spurs him to immediate murder. Secondly, we now know why Iago's revenge had to include not only the man who had overlooked him, Othello, and the man who had supplanted him, Cassio, but also the virtuous Desdemona.

So will I turn her virtue into pitch,
 And out of her own goodness make the net
 That shall enmesh them all.

(II. iii. 366-8).

She was the root of the whole trouble.

When we come to the next question, the history of the handkerchief, we tread upon even surer ground. The handkerchief presents its own problem.

¹⁰ The two roots of Iago's villainy are lack of money, which he uses Roderigo to supply, and disappointment of promotion, which is put right at the climax of the play, III. iii. 480. He is essentially a man with a grievance which the bitter workings of his mind have grossly exaggerated. The accusation of unchastity between Othello and Emilia is valuable (in Shakespeare's version) rather as showing the way of Iago's thinking, than as providing a motive for his action. Cf. the Cinthio novel.

We know that Othello gave it to Desdemona in Venice, that it was his 'first' gift to her, that she regarded it with a remarkable affection. We know too how Othello had come to possess it :

That handkerchief
 Did an Egyptian to my mother give ;
 She was a charmer, and could almost read
 The thoughts of people: she told her, while she kept it,
 'Twould make her amiable and subdue my father
 Entirely to her love, but if she lost it
 Or made a gift of it, my father's eye
 Should hold her loathed and his spirits should hunt
 After new fancies: she, dying, gave it me ;
 And bid me when my fate would have me wive,
 To give it her. I did so: ... (III. iv. 55-65).

We know that Othello regarded it with a superstitious awe :

... there's magic in the web of it :
 A sibyl, that had number'd in the world
 The sun to course two hundred compasses,
 In her prophetic fury sew'd the work ;
 The worms were hallow'd that did breed the silk ;
 And it was dyed in mummy which the skilful
 Conserved of maidens' hearts. ... (III. iv. 69-75)

And yet despite this opinion of Othello's, despite the fact that he was commanded to give it to none other than his wife and to give it at the outset of his marriage, we have on previous interpretations been compelled to suppose that he, man of his word and soldier trained to obedience that he was, did nothing of the sort, but gave it to a young girl with whom admittedly he was in love, but from marriage with whom he was then divided by the triple barrier of rank, race and colour. We cannot accept this. Is it not much more likely that he gave it her when their marriage was legally contracted before a witness, when he could indeed say, "She is fast my wife." ? Does not this give the handkerchief a significance not only more worthy of the part played by it in the tragedy, but also of the respect with which Othello and Desdemona regard it ? Is not the very giving of the handkerchief, granted the terms on which Othello received it and the awe in which he held it, proof that they were married in Venice before Act I begins ? It is, in Othello's words, a "foregone conclusion."

Thus I would suggest, that when, under the influence of Iago's 'temptation', Othello falls into the horror of imagining Desdemona's supposed acts of unchastity, he imagines them occurring at Venice. It is my claim that the proposal gives greater point and vigour to our understanding of the play, and that it is not merely an armchair fancy but a view of the play eminently effective on the stage. There is no better example of this than the scene in which Iago plies Cassio about Bianca while Othello, supposing that they speak of Desdemona, listens unobserved. He comes to that fatal eaves-dropping doubting his wife's honesty,

remembering that only a few weeks earlier his own relations with her were secretly conducted, that Cassio was the one man who knew of this, and that he, Othello, had wittingly entrusted her honour and safety to the possessor of this dangerous knowledge.

Cas. She was here even now; she haunts me in every place. I was the other day talking on the sea-bank with certain Venetians; and thither comes the bauble, and, by this hand, she falls me thus about my neck —

Oth. Crying 'O dear Cassio!' as it were: his gesture imports it.

Cas. So hangs, and lolls, and weeps upon me; so hailes, and pulls me: ha, ha, ha!

Oth. Now he tells how she plucked him to my chamber. (IV. i. 136-146).

The talk of Cassio's marrying Bianca, which Othello takes to mean marrying Desdemona, whom he thus sees publicly advertising her disloyalty and his dishonour, means to Othello that his life is in danger from Cassio, and that Desdemona has wished him to be murdered. But the vital point for the moment is that Othello's phrase 'my chamber' following hard upon Cassio's talk of 'certain Venetians' is proof of my contention that Othello and Desdemona were married before the beginning of Act. I. The time-scheme of the play being what it is, it is difficult to adopt any other interpretation of the phrase. The four ideas, Cassio, Desdemona, chamber, Venice, are brought together in a single thought.

Indeed, it is now plain that the tragedy arises not out of any flaw in Othello's character, but primarily out of the very passion and generosity of Desdemona's love for him. It has always been difficult to account for the rapidity with which Othello's suspicions are kindled. We have now the most rational explanation, namely, that Othello, essentially a man of honour, knew and could not forget that his own relations with Desdemona in Venice, though actually within the law,¹¹ had been in form and circumstance indistinguishable from an illicit amour. He knew her expertness in their deception of her father: in retrospect it appalled him. If she could lie, and he knew she could — the handkerchief was only added proof —, there was inevitably no certainty as to where her falsehoods ended. Moreover, he knew Cassio to be included in part of her deception. Why not more involved?

Desdemona herself was keenly aware of this. We have her comment on the scene where Othello treats her as a harlot:

'Tis meet I should be used so, very meet.

How have I been behav'd, that he might stick

The smallest opinion on my least misuse? (IV. ii. 108-110).

What was Desdemona's 'least misuse'? The loss of the handkerchief? Her elopement? Clear-headed as she is she would not say that either

¹¹ We are, of course, assuming that Shakespeare transferred the law and custom of England in and about 1600 to Venice, just as he transferred Elizabethan costume to Marcus Brutus and the Rome of 44 B.C.

of these entitled her husband to reproach her so bitterly. Rather, as I would argue, her thought is of her giving of herself to Othello in Venice in a way which, though within the law, possessed all the appearance of a cheap affair. Even so he has acted outrageously, but only so is there any possible sense in that line, her one comment made directly to the audience and therefore highly significant,

"Tis meet I should be used so, very meet.

Despite the despair and self-reproach of that comment Desdemona continues her defence. She has already commanded Emilia:

Prithee, to-night

Lay on my bed my wedding sheets: remember; ... (IV. ii. 104-5).

The wedding sheets are of the highest importance:

I

They are no mere appeal to sentiment. They have a legal significance (see *Deuteronomy*, XXII. 13-21). Their purpose is to remind Othello that he found Desdemona a virgin.¹²

II

But, if the first night on Cyprus was also their first night together, as I am trying to show it was not, and if, as I consider proved, Desdemona is murdered on the next night, then an appeal to the wedding sheets would be quite unnecessary. That Desdemona should make such an appeal demonstrates conclusively that they must have spent their first night together some time in Venice. Under the circumstances it is the only conclusion.

III

The sheets are in themselves no disproof of the accusation made against her — unchastity after the contract. In IV. iii. she seems to realise the limitations of their help in her distress:

Emil. I have laid those sheets you bade me on the bed.

Des. All's one. Good faith, how foolish are our minds! (II. 22-3).

Plainly Othello does not recognise them in V. ii. — he would hardly fail to comment if he did — and it is infinitely pathetic to realise that Desdemona's one frail attempt to draw his attention to them,

¹² Cf. Burton, *Anatomy of Melancholy*, Part 3, Sec. 3, Mem. 2 (ed. pub. Tegg & Co., 1857, p. 643): "Leo Afer in his time at Fez, in Africa, *non credunt virginem esse nisi videant sanguineam mappam; si non, ad parentes pudore rejicitur*. Those sheets are publicly shown by their parents, and kept as a sign of incorrupt virginity."

Will you come to bed, my lord?

obviously only hardens his opinion of her as a vicious, sensual woman.

IV

It is necessary to understand precisely Desdemona's motive in having them brought out. They could not prove her chastity after marriage. They would not absolve her of the crime of which she was accused. She had already made her declaration of innocence:

Oth. Why, what art thou?

Des. Your wife, my lord; your true

And loyal wife.

(IV. ii. 34-5).

But in his last outburst in this scene he called her "that cunning whore of Venice That married with Othello. ...", (II. 89-90), — almost a charge that she was no virgin when he married her. Plainly the first step in her defence was to restore him from this wildness. The wedding sheets were brought out for precisely this.

V

But as far as the present argument is concerned, the chief issue is that stated under II, namely, that they prove as clearly as is possible that Othello and Desdemona spent their first night together not in Cyprus but in Venice.

Nevertheless, there is in the text of the play proof, as it would seem, that the exact contrary is true, that their first night together and their first night in Cyprus are in fact one and the same.

The Herald in II. ii. explicitly states that the occasion of the festivities he is proclaiming is "the celebration of his [Othello's] nuptial." This is immediately succeeded by the following passage which begins the brawl scene:

Oth. ... [*To Desdemona*] Come, my dear love,
The purchase made, the fruits are to ensue;
That profit's yet to come 'tween me and you.
Good night.

[*Exeunt Othello, Desdemona and Attendants*]. (II. iii. 9-11).¹³

¹³ There is a slight difference between Quarto and Folio here:

1st. Quarto.

The purchase made, the fruits are to enfue,
The profits yet to come twixt me and you,
Good night. *Exit Othello and Desdemona.*

The meaning of this couplet (ll. 9-10) has never been questioned, because of what follows :

Enter Iago.

Cas. Welcome, Iago ; we must to the watch.

Iago. Not this hour, lieutenant ; 'tis not yet ten o'clock. Our general cast us thus early for the love of his Desdemona ; who let us not therefore blame : he hath not yet made wanton the night with her ; and she is sport for Jove.

Cas. She's a most exquisite lady.

Iago. And, I'll warrant her, full of game.

Cas. Indeed she's a most fresh and delicate creature.

Iago. What an eye she has ! methinks it sounds a parley of provocation.

Cas. An inviting eye ; and yet methinks right modest.

Iago. And when she speaks, is it not an alarum to love ?

Cas. She is indeed perfection.

Iago. Well, happiness to their sheets ! Come, lieutenant, I have a stoup of wine ; (II. iii. 12-30).

Iago says this is their first night together. That is certain. It is equally certain that Iago is a liar. His purpose in this dialogue is clear enough : to draw from Cassio an admission of love for Desdemona, a hint however slight on which to build. But Cassio is severely circumspect. At "She is indeed perfection", a generous reply, yet curt and final, Iago gives up the attempt.

Nevertheless this was a bold undertaking for Iago. He did not dare to go too far or seem to know too much. Therefore he began with a deliberate misinterpretation of Othello's last lines which he had just overheard as he approached, the misinterpretation being as it were a "flag and sign" of innocence calculated to put Cassio off his guard. For Cassio, unaware that Iago knew the history of Othello's marriage, would therefore not expect him to realise the other and real meaning of the couplet.

The key line is

The purchase made, the fruits are to ensue.

And the key words are *fruits* and *purchase*. The word *fruits* is taken to refer to Othello's enjoyment of Desdemona and *purchase* to his marriage with her. That is certainly how Iago takes it, if it is true he overhears the line.

Enter Iago.

1st. Folio.

The purchase made, the fruits are to ensue,
That profit's yet to come tweene me, and you.
Good night.

Exit.

Enter Iago.

There is nothing vital here, except, perhaps, the order of the stage directions.

But by this interpretation *fruits* is understood as a metaphor for the sexual act, which is to give the word a most unusual connotation. There is however a metaphorical use of *fruit* which, though less common today, was frequent enough in Tudor and Stuart English. The O.E.D. puts it thus :

Fruit . . .

6. Offspring, progeny. Also an embryo, foetus. Orig a Hebraism. Now rare exc. in Biblical phraseology. More fully, fruit of the body, loins, womb.

Numerous examples follow.

Nor does *purchase* mean merely the ceremony of marriage. Again, it would be remarkable if it did. Part of the O.E.D. article reads as follows:

Purchase

3. ...

b. Concubinage. Obs.

[Cf. OF. *enfant, fils de porchas*, bastard child, 13th c.] a 1300 *Cursor M.* 26284 Bot he be yong o suilkin state þat he mai wif forbere na-gate Oper o spous or purches. 1513 DOUGLAS *Æneis* IX, xi. 72 Son to the bustuus nobill Sarpedon, In purches get a Thebane wenche apoun.

In other words, the couplet is another example of the ubiquitous Shakespearian pun. *Purchase* is here used as *Nunnery* is used in *Hamlet*, and as words like *brown*, *proud*, and *copper* are frequently used in the plays. The clause, "the fruits are to ensue", merely remarks the fact that Othello and Desdemona are as yet childless, and the phrase "the purchase made" is proof positive that they have been married and their marriage consummated some time. The use of the word *purchase* is only further support for the suggestion that theirs was a contract marriage entered upon in secret. The first night in Cyprus is not their first night together, Othello himself says so, but it is what the Herald calls it: the "*celebration of their nuptials*." It is no more.

Our last evidence takes us outside the play itself to its source in Cinthio's *Il Moro di Venezia*. That — I think we may take it — was the story running in Shakespeare's mind when he wrote his tragedy. That was the story which many in the first audiences would have in their minds as they watched the play unfold, especially the Blackfriars audiences referred to on the 1st Quarto title page. Accordingly we find :

It happened that a virtuous lady of marvellous beauty, named Disdemona, fell in love with the Moor, moved thereto by his valour ; and he, vanquished by the beauty and the noble character of Disdemona, returned her love; and their affection was so mutual that, although the parents of the lady strove all they could to induce her to take another husband, *she consented to marry the Moor* ; and they lived in such harmony and peace in Venice that no word ever passed between them that was not affectionate and kind.

I quote from the translation given with the Italian text in the *Furness Variorum Edition*. The italics are mine.

This is the full extent of the argument for contract marriage in *Othello*. Although I have adduced what I believe to be weighty and conclusive proofs, the Handkerchief, the Wedding Sheets, Desdemona's soliloquy, etc., yet at the outset I said, and here repeat, that there is no self-sufficient verbal proof. The situation created by contract marriages is something the first audiences would have grasped easily. If we reject it, we are left with a mortal flaw in the logic of the play.

Nevertheless, it may seem to some that to confess that contract marriage is implicit and not explicit is to admit a dangerous weakness in the argument. Such an objector might well agree that if we could prove contract marriage in *Othello*, it would certainly strengthen our reading of the play, and yet argue that no proof is conclusive without explicit, verbal evidence. This would be an attitude of extreme caution, and yet seem for that very reason a most proper attitude to adopt. How do we know that we are not imagining more than Shakespeare intended us to imagine?

This is an objection that can only be answered by analogy: for example, the case of Montano. We know of him among other things that he was Othello's predecessor in the governorship of Cyprus, and this knowledge depends upon two points:

- i) The heading in the 1st. Quarto to II. i., "*Enter Montanio, Gouvernor of Cypres, with two other Gentlemen.*"
- ii) The list of "*The Actors Names*" in the 1st Folio, "*Montano, Governor of Cyprus.*"

There is no statement in the dialogue of the play which even suggests this fact about him,¹⁴ except that Iago, who has just been carousing with him as an equal, twice addresses him after he is wounded as, "Sir Montano", and that a breathless messenger delivers a message to the Senate from him in I. iii.

Shakespeare wrote the play to be heard, not read. The first audiences had to understand this young man's importance merely from whatever prominence he received by his costume and his position on the stage in II. i. Yet the fact is vital. Without it we should be at a loss to comprehend why Othello's judgment on Cassio had to be so severe, and Iago's subtlety when, while Cassio and Montano fight, he tells Roderigo to "go out and cry a *mutiny*" (II. iii. 157), for *mutiny* is no great exaggeration of a violent attack on one who only a few hours earlier was governor of the island and remains a person of high importance. But the position is this: apart from the two points quoted above, both of them outside the dialogue of the play, there is no absolute proof of Montano's position. This important fact is to anyone hearing and seeing the play only implicit.

The analogy I am indicating is self-evident. The case for contract marriage rests on a dual argument: the negative argument, that without it the logic of the play falls; and the positive argument that certain

¹⁴ In Cinthio's story Montano is referred to as "a soldier of the guard". *Furness Variorum Edition*, p. 379.

indications, the Handkerchief, and others, point directly to it. There is not a word in the play which defeats it. The case for Montano's rank and authority, if based only on the dialogue of the play would be far less strong.

This is the end of the matter. It remains only to summarise.

- I. Double Time is impossible. Long Time will not work. Short Time is the only probable time-scheme.
- II. The accusations of unchastity made against Desdemona are associated with Venice. This is to be expected since there is no time for the supposed amour with Cassio in Cyprus.
- III. The Handkerchief and the Wedding Sheets provide evidence that Othello and Desdemona had been man and wife sometime before leaving Venice. We suggest that it was a contract marriage, entered upon in secret and witnessed by Cassio.
- IV. The couplet on which Othello makes his first exit in II. iii. is found on further examination to support this view of the history of Othello's 'courtship'.
- V. Iago's accusation is therefore strictly neither of fornication nor yet of adultery. The supposed unchastity must be imagined as occurring after the contract but before the marriage which we may suppose was celebrated immediately after the elopement with the gondolier.

This reading of the play gives an interpretation solving all old difficulties, presenting no new ones, free from inconsistencies, vigorous, and effective on the stage. Desdemona could not be false to *marriage*, that is, false after the arrival in Cyprus. No one in the play supposes that she was. We have remarked the careful avoidance of the words *fornication* and *adultery* throughout the text. At a crucial moment in the denouement the word *marriage* is itself avoided. Othello is trying to justify himself:

Oth. O, I were damn'd beneath all depth in hell,
But that I did proceed upon just grounds
To this extremity. Thy husband knew it all.

Emil. My husband!

Oth. Thy husband.

Emil. That she was false to wedlock?

Oth. Ay, with Cassio.

(V. ii. 137-142).

Notes and News

War Words. Further contributions have been received from Miss H. W. Schalkwijk, of Rotterdam, Mr. J. M. Nosworthy, of Groningen, Dr. W. Gilomen, of Aarau (Switzerland), and Dr. H. Marchand, of Istanbul. We reproduce some of their notes, with comments and additions of our own, in the order hitherto observed.

a. *Evacuation* and related words. Dr. Marchand suggests that *evacuee* is a borrowing of French *évacué*, itself a war word. If 'war word' is taken in the sense of a word coined after the outbreak of war, this supposition is hardly tenable, as the English word was in use in the very earliest days of the war, before there had been time to borrow a French word coined after September 3rd. It is, of course, possible and, indeed, likely that the French (and, for that matter, the English) word was in use some time before the beginning of hostilities, in which case Dr. Marchand's suggestion might be capable of proof. At present, however, it seems hardly possible to settle this question.

There is some evidence that *evacuate* and its congeners (including 'self-evacuating', 're-evacuation', etc.) have offended the linguistic feeling of the better educated. Mr. A. P. Herbert lodged an energetic protest in *The Listener* of Feb. 22, on the ground that "you don't say that you have 'evacuated' a pint pot when you have drunk half a pint. At no time did the Government intend that London, Liverpool or Manchester should be 'evacuated' — that is 'made empty'. Then why use the word?" Mr. Herbert's objection may be less cogent than symptomatic, but it is by no means exceptional. The corruptions to which this word-group lends itself in the mouths of the uneducated form another source of offence, witness the butler's "'Er Lad'ship 'as been *revacuated* to London, Sir", *Punch*, Jan. 1940. As early as the autumn of 1939 *English*, the magazine of the English Association, recorded an Oxford don's rather donnish complaint that he had been visited by a 'formidable *evacuatrix*', adding somewhat pontifically, apropos of this and other "notable additions to the English language" that "it is for the Association to make up its mind whether or not to accept these gifts to our vocabulary."

From Miss Schalkwijk's notes we quote: "He had evacuated into his house four ladies ...", heard from the Dean of St. Paul's during his recent visit to Holland, and: "Miss Littlemug's views on petrol-rationing, evacuated children and — still more — *de-evacuated* children, interesting to a degree, are yet apt to take up rather more of the morning or afternoon than one is able to spare ..." (*Punch*, Jan. 1940). Dr. Gilomen has noted 'evacuable areas' (*Observer*, July 7, 1939) — a quotation especially valuable also for its date —; "This is what a mother-evacuee said" (*Sunday Times*, Feb. 4, 1940); and the abbreviation and derivative *evacs* and *evacu-imps* (the latter presumably children; the full quotation runs: "The *evacu-imps* are charming"), both from the *Observer*, March 24, 1940.

b. *Billeting*. From Picture Post, March 23, 1940, apropos of the transfer of Cheltenham College to Shrewsbury School: "Cheltonians at Lunch in their Billets ... A billet on Kingsland — within five minutes walk from the school. In the background is Mr. J. B. Oldham, to whom the *billet-house* belongs." (Contributed by Miss S.) According to the autumn number of *English*, just quoted, "Children who leave their billets are informed officially that they are not '*rebilletable*'."

c. *Black-out*. Dr. Gilomen has noted: "Berlin was well blacked-out" (Observer, Jan. 1940), and: "Without books the brainier of our dug-in soldiers and blacked-out civilians will go mad" (Shaw in Foylibra, Sept. 1939) — confirming Miss Rekkers' observation that *blacked-out*, not *black-outed*, is the usual past participle. Also: "No amount of *blacking out* can prevent bombing" (Observer, Jan. 1940).

A metaphorical use of 'black-out'¹ has been noted in the (American) Saturday Review of Literature: "This book should render great service in extricating the truth from under a blackout of subtly woven and cemented lies" (Feb 17, 1940). There is another instance in an advertisement of a book called *A Stricken Field* appearing in the number for March 16, 1940, of the same review: "A swift, compassionate novel of the blackout of a nation, of courageous human beings who have managed to face the Juggernaut and live." One wonders, though, whether in this last example, at any rate, the word does not rather hark back to the nineteenth-century meaning illustrated in the OED under Black v., 3b: *to black out*: to obliterate with black. Ex.: 1850 Browning, Christmas Eve: If he blacked out in a blot Thy brief life's pleasantness.

With reference to 'siren suits', the autumn number of *English* observes that "ladies' dress-shops ambiguously advertise 'siren-suits' for the Air Raid Shelter."

Dr. Gilomen adds '*gas-mask holder*' and '*gas-mask case*' (Observer, Sept. 1939) to the names for this utensil mentioned in our February number.

Many of the words and expressions tentatively contributed have turned out on reference to the OED to date back to the war of 1914-1918, or even earlier. Thus the earliest quotations for *chaser* and *warplane* are dated 1915, *seaplane* and *flying boat* 1913, *mop up* ("gun-nests were mopped up") 1901, *surface* vb. ("the submarine immediately surfaced") being said of a fish as far back as 1898. *Landgirls* also existed in the last war; the OED (Supplement) has a quotation from 1919.²

A similar discovery was made in regard to the word '*navicert*' (= naval

¹ Cf. the following quotation from the autumn number of *English*: "To express the idealistic determination of the country to see the present war through to victory with a sincerity which does not evade the prevailing gloom engendered by *black-outs*, *actual* and *symbolic*, ..." (our italics.)

² *Dive-bomber* (G. Stuka = *Sturzkampf[flugzeug]*), however, is probably quite recent. *Fifth column* dates from the Spanish civil war.

certificate) mentioned in our February number and unrecorded in the OED or its Supplement. By sheer good luck we recently came across a monograph on *The "Navicert" System During the World War*, by H. Ritchie (Washington, D.C., 1938), which opens with the following definition :

This system, which first became operative in March, 1916, when it was made applicable to cargoes shipped from the United States to the Scandinavian countries adjacent to Germany, was in substance a system whereby particular consignments of goods were given what might be called a commercial passport before they were shipped; this passport, which derived its name from the code-word "navicert", insured the consignment an undisturbed passage. (p. 1.)

In the official statement issued by the British Embassy at Washington to the American Press the word 'navicerts' did not occur, 'letters of assurance' being used instead. As far as we have been able to ascertain, Mr. Ritchie nowhere explicitly states that 'navicert' is a contraction of 'naval certificate', though he does use the word 'certificate' in this connection more than once. We think we heard 'naval certificate' as the parent phrase of 'navicert' given by the BBC at the time, but are not absolutely certain.

As Mr. Ritchie states on p. 7 of his monograph, under the heading *The Navicert System*, the scheme was known to the United States authorities as the Skinner scheme, from the name of the United States Consul General in London, who first suggested it. One gathers that the word 'navicert' must have been coined by someone in the Trade Department of the British Embassy at Washington; it would, therefore, be an example of a 'British' word born on American soil — surely a unique phenomenon. The system, consequently also the word, lost much of its significance after the entry of the USA into the war in 1917 — to be revived in 1939. — Z.

Dr. B. A. P. van Dam †. Dr. B. A. P. van Dam, author of *The Text of Shakespeare's Hamlet* and other works, and a frequent contributor to *English Studies*, who died on April 10th, held a medical, not a literary degree. The marvel is that one who originally approached the study of Elizabethan drama as an amateur should have become one of the best-known representatives of English studies in Holland abroad. At the turn of the century his name was associated with that of C. Stoffel, probably the greatest English philologist this country has produced, in the publication of *William Shakespeare, Prosody and Text*, followed in 1902 by *Chapters on English Printing, Prosody, and Pronunciation (1550-1700)*. His monograph on the text of *Hamlet* appeared in 1924, followed by one on *King Lear* in 1935, when this indefatigable worker was seventy-nine.

Dr. van Dam was first and foremost a textual critic. What distinguished him from many others who have attempted to reconstruct the text of Shakespeare was his belief that Shakespeare always wrote perfectly regular

iambic verse, and that it is the duty of a modern editor to restore the traditional text to its pristine purity by detecting and removing the interpolations and other changes mainly due to adaptation for scenic purposes. In 1925 Dr. van Dam explained his principles and methods in an article on *Textual Criticism of Shakespeare's Plays* published in this journal.

Dr. van Dam's views have not met with unqualified acceptance, especially in England, though no amount of adverse criticism ever shook his conviction of their fundamental rightness. Whatever the ultimate verdict on his work, there can be no question of his great service to the textual study of the Elizabethan drama. One of the greatest of English bibliographers, A. W. Pollard, reviewing Van Dam's *Hamlet* in this journal in 1924, summed up his opinion in the following words, with which this notice, too, may be fittingly concluded: "But whether one agrees with Dr. van Dam or not, he is always ingenious as well as painstaking, and I know no other book on the text of *Hamlet* which raises so many interesting points." — Z.

Reviews

Chaucer's Romance Vocabulary. By JOSEPH MERSAND.
IX + 173 pp. Brooklyn—New-York: The Comet Press, Inc.
1937.

"The purpose of this thesis is ... to establish, on the basis of exact statistics the extent of Chaucer's Romance vocabulary and from this point of view to trace as definitely as possible the steps of his linguistic development." Before the writer lays the result of his investigation before us, he gives us an admirable survey of the opinions on Chaucer's vocabulary throughout the ages. After two centuries of undiluted praise (cf. Spenser's "well of English undefiled") a controversy is started by the publication in 1605 of Richard Verstegan's "Restitution of Decayed Intelligence". Verstegan denies that Chaucer "illuminated" the English language and calls him "a great mingler of English with French, vnto which Language by lyke, for that he was descended of French or rather wallon race, he caryed a great affection."¹ This controversy was continued for several centuries and even at the present day we may distinguish two groups of students. The first group (Pollard, Bradley, Legouis, Fernald, Weekley) either minimizes the extent of Chaucer's additions to the Romance elements in English or they are not convinced that such additions can be traced definitely to the poet. The second group (Drennan, Smith, Cowling) ascribe to Chaucer many verbal innovations, yet they, unlike Verstegan and his followers, no longer reproach him for introducing them.

¹ It is not astonishing that Verstegan (or Verstegen) should have expressed adverse criticism of Chaucer's extensive use of Romance words. He was a scholar of Dutch descent, who took great interest in Germanic etymology and in Anglo-Saxon, and consequently resented the loss of many native words that were replaced by French ones.

After a careful investigation of all the previous compilations and statistics of Chaucer's words, Mersand concludes that up till now a scientific numerical study of Chaucer's Romance vocabulary based on an examination of all the works of the poet has not been made. When starting on his thesis the writer concluded that the only way to determine the nature of this vocabulary was to count every word Chaucer used, to investigate the etymology of every word, and, finally, to arrange, add, and compute carefully. A prerequisite for this study was a complete vocabulary of every word used. Mersand used Tatlock's *Concordance* (1927) as a basis for the words, with Skeat's *Glossary* and Tyrwhitt's *Glossary* to supplement and check. The N.E.D. was taken as the authority for most of the etymologies; in doubtful cases other dictionaries and glossaries were consulted. Mersand worked with Skeat's text, as printed in his *Oxford Chaucer*, the thesis being begun four years before F. N. Robinson's edition was published. The present book represents the results of five years' research.

Mersand found that in all the works, prose as well as poetry, 4,189 words of Romance descent are used (exclusive of direct quotations from Latin and French). Of these 335 are derived from Anglo-French, 3,539 from Continental French, 315 from Latin. The percentage of nouns of this Romance vocabulary is 58.84, verbs 19.19, adjectives 17.47, prepositions 0.04, adverbs 4.05, interjections 0.33, conjunctions 0.04. The total of non-Romance words (primarily of Anglo-Saxon and Scandinavian origin) is 3,883. So the grand total of Chaucer's vocabulary is 8,072, of which 51.8 per cent is derived from Romance sources, 49.3 (sic!) per cent from Germanic sources. Further etymological research will probably tend to increase rather than decrease the Romance percentage. 27.17 per cent of the Romance words used by Chaucer have not appeared earlier in texts available to the editors of the N.E.D., and though new publications and vocabularies will reduce this percentage, it is probable that a large number of these words were actually introduced by Chaucer.

Mersand then proceeds to compare the vocabularies of Chaucer and his contemporaries. In the case of Gower and Maundeville, where scientific vocabularies were available (Macaulay, Fife), he gives full comparative lists of numbers and percentages. This comparison proves that both Chaucer's total vocabulary and his Romance vocabulary are approximately twice as large as those of Gower. All the assertions about the equality of the vocabularies of these two poets are thus proved invalid. The relation between the Romance and Germanic elements in Gower's language, however, is not very different from that in Chaucer's (total 4,502, Romance 2,271). The same holds good for Maundeville (total 2,707, Romance 1,390). The number of Romance words which Chaucer and Gower have in common is 1,708. Gower's Romance words not used by Chaucer (563) strike us as extremely foreign, whereas the majority of Chaucer's words sound familiar to us. There can be no doubt that Chaucer made Romance words which had greater permanency in English literature than those of any other Middle-English writers.

In the following chapters Mersand gives the statistics of all the poems and tales separately, and draws his conclusions :

Chaucer formed only a small percentage of his new words from words in his sources. The remainder he may have adopted from the colloquial English of his time or formed independently.

Chaucer used a smaller percentage of Romance words when translating from a French source than when utilizing Latin or Italian sources.

Chaucer used few Romance words in his early works, increased his store of them after his acquaintance with Italian literature and used most of them at the height of his popularity at the Court. This was probably at the time of his composition of the *Legend of Good Women*. After his reversal of fortune in 1386 he abandoned many of his Romance words which he used, in all probability, to satisfy the Gallic tastes of Court circles.

Works chronologically closely related will have a large percentage of their Romance vocabulary in common.

These vocabulary tests may be employed to verify the accepted chronology of his works and to suggest a few changes. Thus the close resemblance between Book I of the *House of Fame* and the *Book of the Duchess* bears out the conjecture of Lowes (*Geoffrey Chaucer*, p. 133) that HF. I was written earlier than Book II and III, at a date near that of BD. — *Ariadne* was composed before the *Knight's Tale*. — The steady enlargement of his vocabulary before 1386 had as its successive stages: *House of Fame*, *Knight's Tale*, *Troilus*, *Prologue B* of the *Legend of Good Women*. — Most of the *Canterbury* poetical tales and the *General Prologue* have a smaller number of Romance words and were written after 1386; the remarkably small percentage of Romance words in the *Miller's Tale* and the *Reeve's Tale* suggests native sources. The vocabularies of the *Clerk's Tale*, the *Man of Law's Tale* and the *Second Nun's Tale*, which show a close relationship, point to an early composition (probably in the early 1370's).

These lists and statistics, compiled with meticulous care, provide interesting and valuable material for the student of Chaucer's language, yet, like all statistics, they should be handled with discrimination. The writer himself is not blind to the fact that subject matter, source, rhyme and metre are bound to influence a poet's language. These are factors that cannot be expressed in figures. Nor does a bare vocabulary, where every word has equal weight, give us an insight into the character of a language. Many of his French words Chaucer discards after having used them once only, whereas a great number of Germanic words occur hundreds of times. Therefore no student of the present thesis should fail to consult Table 5 of Appendix I, which shows that, though 51.8 per cent of Chaucer's vocabulary is derived from Romance sources, the average number of Romance words used per line in his poetical works, ranging between 0.3 and 1.7, in the great majority of the poems amounts to less than one.

Die nationale Literatur Schottlands von den Anfängen bis zur Renaissance. Von FRIEDRICH BRIE. 371 pp. Halle: Max Niemeyer. 1937. RM. 14.

It is a reproach to Scottish scholars that authorities on Scottish literature should so frequently belong to any country except Scotland. The editor of the first great edition of Dunbar was an Austrian; the best books on Burns are probably those by a Frenchman and a German; and now Professor Brie has made himself master of a period and a literature which interest primarily Scots — the period during which Scotland fought for its very existence against England.

English poetry of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries differed essentially from that of Scotland, in that it had no clearly defined national character; individual patriots might be celebrated, by people like Minot, but they were treated like heroes of romance, and English writers as a whole were far removed from political and religious influences. Scotland, on the other hand, from 1286 to the Reformation was ruled by a single idea — that of independence, marked by opposition to England. Brie's work is a study of this idea as reflected in Scottish literature of the time, a literature which made the conception of national freedom the spiritual property of the nation. The heroic figures of Scotland, too, were real, not characters in a romance; the chroniclers and poets were interdependent, the poets studied earlier chronicles for their data, the historians the earlier poetry.

The greater part of Brie's work is taken up with a study of Barbour's *Brus* and the *Wallace* of 'Blind Harry'. This is but justice, since from an early date the figures of Wallace and Bruce became centres of national sentiment; and poetry forms a most interesting illustration of and commentary on contemporary historical documents. Brie dissects the poems, and examines them in detail; he discusses, for instance, the relation of *The Brus* to chronicle, biography and verse romance, and places it on a higher level than contemporary English verse chronicles. In many ways, too, *The Brus* is more realistic, more true to life, than its English contemporaries — or its continental ones, for that matter — since it is remarkably impartial, sees the faults even in its heroes, and allots praise to the enemy. Yet in it war is war, and not mere romantic tournaments.

The Brus, Professor Brie thinks, with a good deal of evidence in his favour, was composed for a special reason; and that reason was the political events of 1370-77, when the descendant of one of his heroes, Walter Stewart, held uneasy sway over Scotland; similarly *The Wallace* probably owes its being to the low ebb of Scottish patriotic feeling in the second half of the fifteenth century. But as a literary genre *The Wallace* is a retrograde step; its hero is a vengeance-wreaking outlaw of the common Germanic type, with few if any signs of a living man. The work is full of 'wishful thinking' and clumsy propaganda, and its closest links are certainly with the exaggerated verse romance.

Brie's examination of Wyntoun's chronicle is not perhaps so much to the point; one tends to forget about the patriotic theme in considering the constituent parts, and their antecedents, in the poem.

The sixteenth century saw a change of attitude; the vigorous English nationalism found only *The Complaint of Scotland* as a Scottish counterpart: political dissension was accurately mirrored in literature.

The book as a whole is undoubtedly of first importance; but there are a number of seeming defects in detail. For instance, the very completeness and detail of the examination of texts involves a good deal of repetition, which is distracting, and surely could have been avoided. It irks, too, to come across the same name spelled in several different forms (Wishart is a good example); complete modernisation of place- and personal names would have been better. There are a number of minor errors of fact, wrong dates and the like, and an occasional ambiguity, such as the reference to Black Agnes (p. 150). On Bower, some supplementary material may be gained from *Charters of the Abbey of Inchcolm*, edited for the Scottish History Society by Dr. D. E. Easson and myself; and a note of his death is in the Corpus Christi Cambridge MS of the *Scotichronicon* (see Montague James's published catalogue).

Edinburgh.

ANGUS MACDONALD.

John Skelton, Laureate. By W. NELSON. (Columbia University Studies in English and Comparative Literature, 139.) vi+266 pp. New York: Columbia University Press. London: Milford. 1939. Price 15s.

While waiting for the first comprehensive edition of Skelton since that of Dyce (1843) promised by Dr. H. L. R. Edwards we are presented with a study about the poet which its author, William Nelson, modestly calls an uncomfortable compromise between a collection of scattered papers and an orderly "Life and Works". So much has been written about Skelton during the last twenty years, especially by American scholars, that Nelson has in the main refrained from discussion of the work of earlier investigators and has restricted himself to developing his own theses. Even a mere rehandling of the old material would have been a welcome gift, but Nelson has above that a fair amount of entirely new information to give.

In his initial chapter, *The Scholars of Henry VII.*, Nelson points out that the first home of Renaissance Latin was not the school, but the court, with the king as prime mover. Realizing the value of humanistic learning to the business of the State, Henry had a permanent need for diplomats and secretaries (mostly aliens) with rhetorical powers and for teachers to train them. An ambassador had to be a humanist. With the same diligence and connoisseurship the new study of grammar and rhetoric, the

moral instruction and the influence of foreign humanists like Carmeliano, Gigli and André are explained to the reader. History is shown to have been the princely subject par excellence. We see the difference between the older group of foreign humanists and the younger one consisting of More, Colet and Erasmus, and what they had in common. More's "eulogy" on Bernard André with its double meaning and his epigram on Carmeliano give us a new piece of information concerning the humourous mind of the great humanist. Skelton himself is shown in his training, his occupation, his literary manner and style and in his position at court to be as one with André, Carmeliano and the other orators of the Tudor court — with one great difference, viz. that, with one exception, he uses the vernacular in all his poems. His occasional poetry is shown, by its similarity to that of André, to belong to the humanist tradition.

Nelson gives some valuable suggestions as to the meaning of laureations and of Skelton's lost comedy *Achademios*, which he believes to have been composed to satisfy the requirements for the degree of Poet Laureate at Oxford. Another of Skelton's lost writings, a *deuoute Prayer to Moyses hornis*, is convincingly explained to have been a moral tract. I am not so certain, however, of the moral purpose in *Elinor Ruming*, in spite of the parallel Nelson furnishes from the description of gluttony in More's *Four Last Things*.

The author is certainly right when in the first of Skelton's extant poems, *Elegy on the death of the Earl of Northumberland*, he already sees the violent and intemperate spirit of the later satires. He makes a new and tempting suggestion when he tries to identify our poet with Master Skelton who helped the representatives of the University of Cambridge with his advice during various contentions with the townspeople.

The vexed problem of the origin of Skeltonic rhyme is approached from a new side. Nelson tries to prove by well-chosen examples that from the tradition of Latin rhymed prose an exaggerated form of English rhymed prose sprang up. Skelton is supposed to have adopted it in some of his English prose-writings and to have transformed it into rhymed poetry which kept a good many traits of the essential irregularity of rhymed prose. I do not doubt that this process really took place to a certain extent, but I am convinced at the same time that Skelton, when writing poetry in his specific rhyme, was influenced as well by other forms of rhyme resembling his. These were extant in early Latin sequences, Goliardic rhymes (cf. *Goliard de suo infortunio*, publ. in *Latin Poems* by Walter Mapes, ed. Wright, Camden Society 1841), in English poems like the *Epitaph of Jaspar late Duke of Bedford* (Dyce II 388 ff., particularly 396 ff.) or in Scotch poems like *Colkebie's Sow* (especially Fitt First V. 51-85). If we take together contents and form — which never ought to be separated —, no poetry is nearer to that of Skelton than certain parts of the rude and grotesque rhyme of *Colkebie*.

The author maintains with good reason that there is no documentary evidence which links Skelton to Diss after 1511, but that there are definite

proofs that he resided in Westminster during the later period of his life, probably on account of its immediate proximity to the royal palace. Nelson deducts from the title of *orator regius* that Skelton may have been used for diplomatic service, but though we cannot help admiring his reasons for ascribing to our poet the use or even the writing of the King's letter to James IV. in the time of Flodden, we cannot refrain from asking ourselves, why Skelton, who is always the trumpeter of his own successes, does not mention this fact or other diplomatic achievements in any of his poems.

New information is won concerning the grammarians' war, among other things a bit of sniping at Erasmus' second edition of the New Testament in *Speak, Parrot*. The brilliant analysis of *Speak, Parrot*, carried on partly in collaboration with Dr. Edwards, breaks down a good deal of the wall of metaphor and allegory that Skelton built around this poem. The interpretation of Skelton's clouded chronological scheme resulting in the date 1521 for *Speak, Parrot* is the best solution hitherto given for some much discussed problems. But one puzzle still remains unsolved: How is it possible that the spies and agents of Cardinal Wolsey could be misled by the poem, when the readers were supposed to look through the intentional obscurities? The learned Cardinal himself was certainly not to be fooled. The open attacks on Wolsey in the later satires by Skelton make it probable to me that all the allegories, hints and allusions are mere sport in the same way as the number cryptograms in *Ware the Hauke* and *Garland of Laurel*.

I doubt whether much is to be said in favour of Nelson's arguments for a reconciliation between Skelton and Wolsey at the end of 1522. If the Envoy with the dedication to the King and to Wolsey is genuine, Skelton is unlikely to have alluded to *Speak, Parrot* or to *Colin Clout* in the poem itself. On another occasion (p. 228) Nelson himself concedes that *Colin Clout* could not be printed before the fall of Wolsey. Leaving aside the question whether *Why Come Ye Not To Court* antedates the *Garland*, the poet's silence about the former would be easily understood by his wish not to draw the attention of his public to this virulent satire. In my "Skelton-Studien" (*Englische Studien* 37, p. 12) I have drawn attention to the fact that the Envoy is omitted in the edition of the *Garland* which appeared in 1523 during the poet's life-time and that Marsh, the editor of the 1568 edition of the works of Skelton, was capable of falsifications just of that kind, as may be seen by his proclaiming the *Book of Three Fooles* to be a work by Skelton and by adding a dedication to the Cardinal to it. As to the dedication to the poem *The Duke of Albany* even Dyce saw that it cannot have belonged to the poem originally. So Nelson does not seem to me to give sufficient reasons for his belief in its authenticity. Finally, some objections may be raised to Nelson's view of Skelton's reputation as a learned rhetorician during his life-time. In spite of the well-known allusions by Caxton, Erasmus (in his Ode to Prince Henry) and Whittinton Skelton is not mentioned in the large correspondence of serious humanist scholars of his time, not even in that of Erasmus. When

Richard Pace in his treatise *De fructu qui ex doctrina precipitur* (Basle 1517) enumerates the most prominent humanists of his time, he does not name Skelton among the English.

Though in the foregoing lines I had some occasion to differ from certain positions taken up by Nelson, he has undoubtedly cleared and furthered a good many problems connected with Skelton. His conscientious and stimulating study will have to be taken into account by all future scholars.

Freiburg i. Br.

FRIEDRICH BRIE.

Bibliography

LANGUAGE

The Old Germanic Principles of Name-Giving. By H. B. WOOLF. xii + 299 pp. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press. 1935. \$4.00. [A review will appear.]

The Jefferson Anglo-Saxon Grammar and Reader. By E. B. SETZLER, E. L. SETZLER and H. H. SETZLER. Macmillan Co. 12s.

Ælfric's Colloquy. Edited by G. N. GARMONSWAY. Methuen. 2s. 6d.

Sermo Lupi ad Anglos. Edited by D. WHITELOCK. Methuen. 2s. 6d.

Abriss der mitttelenglischen Grammatik. Von K. BRUNNER. 90 pp. Halle/Saale: Niemeyer. 1938. Geh. RM. 2.40; geb. RM. 3.20. [See Review, Dec. 1939.]

The "Liber De Diversis Medicinis" in the Thornton MS. (MS. Lincoln Cathedral A. 5.2.) Edited by M. S. OGDEN. For the EETS. London: Milford. 10s.

A Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue. From the Twelfth Century to the end of the Seventeenth. By SIR WILLIAM A. CRAIGIE. Part VIII, D-Dignité. University of Chicago Press. London: Milford. 21s.

A Dictionary of the Low-Dutch Element in the English Vocabulary. By J. F. BENSE. Part V: Smeary — Zwart-wit-pens. xvi, 417-663 pp. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff. 1939. Price of the complete work, 32 guilders, buckram. [A review will appear.]

The English Hundred-Names. The South-Eastern Counties. With a Survey of Elements found in Hundred-Names and a Chapter on the Origin of the Hundred. By O. S. ANDERSON. (Lunds Universitets Arsskrift. N.F. Avd. 1. Bd. 37. Nr. 1.) XI + 242 pp. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup. 1939. Price Sw. kr. 10.—. [A review will appear.]

Middle English ū and Related Sounds, their Development in Early American English. By H. WHITEHALL. (Language Monograph No. 19.) 79 pp. Baltimore: Linguistic Society of America. (Supplement to *Language*. Vol. 15. No. 4. Oct.-Dec. 1939.) [A review will appear.]

The Articles. A Study of their Theory and Use in English. By P. CHRISTOPHERSEN. Copenhagen: Einar Munksgaard. London: Milford. 12s. 6d. [See Review, Oct. 1939.]

A Grammar of English Words. By H. E. PALMER. xvi + 300 pp. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1938. Price 5s. [A review will appear.]

An Introduction to the Study of English Sounds. By E. KRUISINGA. Seventh Edition. 218 pp. Groningen: P. Noordhoff. 1940. f 2.50, cloth f 3.00. [A review will appear.]

The Phonetics of English. By I. WARD. Third Edition. xv + 255 pp. Cambridge: Heffer. 1939. 5s. net. [A review will appear.]

Broadcast English. Recommendations to Announcers regarding the Pronunciation of some British Family Names and Titles. Collected by A. LLOYD JAMES. B.B.C. 1s. 6d.

The Rhythm of English Prose. By A. CLASSE. 138 pp. Oxford: Blackwell. 1939. 10s. 6d. [A review will appear.]

Der Industrie-Dialekt von Birmingham. Intonation und Sprachvariante. Von H.-O. WILDE. (Studien zur engl. Philologie XCIV.) 88 pp. Halle: Niemeyer. 1938. RM. 3.40. [A review will appear.]

Lautdauer und Intonation in der Sprache von Stanley Baldwin. Von R. BIRK. (Lebendige Sprache, Heft 6.) 16 pp. + 98 plates. Berlin: W. de Gruyter. 1939. RM. 8.—.

Intonation und Lautgebung in der Sprache von Lloyd George. Von H. ROHMANN. (Lebendige Sprache, experimentalphonetische Untersuchungen herausgegeben von W. Horn und K. Ketterer, Heft 5.) 19 pp. + 85 plates. Berlin: W. de Gruyter. 1939. RM. 8.—.

Die phonetischen Mittel der Deklamation bei W. J. Holloway in der Wiedergabe der Leichenrede des Mark Anton (Shakespeare, Julius Caesar, III, 2). Von A. SIEGLOCH. 26 pp. + 83 plates. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter. 1939. RM. 8.—.

The English Duden. By H. KLIEN and M. RIDPATH-KLIEN. Harrap. 7s. 6d.

A Mark Twain Lexicon. By R. L. RAMSAY and F. G. EMBERSON. (The University of Missouri Studies. XIII. 1.) cxix + 278 pp. Columbia: University of Missouri. Price \$ 1.25. [A review will appear.]

An Anglo-American Interpreter. A Vocabulary and Phrase Book. By H. W. HORWILL. Oxford: Clarendon Press. London: Milford. 2s. 6d.

En Sprogmands Levned. Av OTTO JESPERSEN. 245 pp. København: Gyldendal. 1938. Dan. Kr. 8.75. [See Review, Febr. 1940.]

HISTORY

Roman Britain and the English Settlements. By R. G. COLLINGWOOD and J. N. L. MYRES. (The Oxford History of England, edited by G. N. CLARK). xxv + 515 pp. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press. 1936. 12s. 6d. net. [A review will appear.]

The Arts in Early England. By G. BALDWIN BROWN. Vol. VI. Part. II: Anglo-Saxon Sculpture. Prepared for press by E. H. L. SEXTON. John Murray. 30s.

Anglo-Saxon Art to A.D. 900. By T. D. KENDRICK. xxi + 272 + civ pp. Methuen. 25s.

Map of Britain in the Dark Ages. North Sheet. Southampton: Ordnance Survey. 5s. [See Brief Mention, Oct. 1939.]

A Map of Old English Monasteries and Related Ecclesiastical Foundations A.D. 400—1066. By ALICE M. RYAN. (Cornell Studies in English XXVIII.) Map + vi + 33 pp. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press. London: Humphrey Milford. 1939. Price \$ 1.00 or 4s. 6d. [See Brief Mention, Oct. 1939.]

Die Körperpflege der Angelsachsen. Eine kulturgeschichtlich-etymologische Untersuchung. (Angl. Forschungen, Heft 86.) Von W. GRAMM. 137 pp. Heidelberg: Winter. 1938. RM. 7.—. [A review will appear.]

Anglo-Saxon Charters. Edited with translation and notes by A. J. ROBERTSON. Cambridge University Press. 25s.

Early Yorkshire Charters. Volume V. The Honour of Richmond, Part II. Edited by C. T. CLAY. The Yorkshire Archaeological Society.

Life on the English Manor. A Study of Peasant Conditions, 1150—1400. By H. S. BENNETT. Cambridge University Press. 16s.

The Constitutional History of Medieval England from the English Settlement to 1485. By J. E. A. JOLLIFFE. Black. 15s.

- Franciscan History and Legend in English Mediæval Art.* Edited by A. G. LITTLE. Manchester University Press. 21s.
- English Homes.* Periods I and II. — Volume II. Mediæval and Early Tudor 1066-1558. By H. AVRAY TIPPING. Country Life. 63s.
- Eynsham under the Monks.* By SIR EDMUND CHAMBERS. Oxford Record Society. 1936.
- Kirchengeschichte und Rechtsgeschichte in England (von der Reformation bis zum frühen 18. Jahrhundert).* Von H. ARNEKE. (Studien zur engl. Philologie, herausg. Morsbach und Wilde, xcl.) vi + 355 pp. Halle (Saale): Niemeyer. 1937. RM. 13.50. [A review will appear.]
- The Jacobean Age.* By DAVID MATHEW. Longmans. 15s.
- The Early Stuarts. 1603-1660.* By GODFREY DAVIES. Oxford: Clarendon Press. London: Milford. 12s. 6d.
- Edward Gibbon, 1737-1794.* By D. M. LOW. Chatto and Windus. 15s.
- Englische Geschichte im 18ten Jahrhundert.* Band IV. Das Zeitalter Walpoles III. Von WOLFGANG MICHAEL. Berlin: Verlag für Staatswissenschaften und Geschichte.
- The Torrington Diaries.* Containing the Tours through England and Wales of the Hon. John Byng. Edited by C. BRUYN ANDREWS. Volume IV. Eyre and Spottiswoode. 18s.
- Die Staatsphilosophie des englischen Idealismus, ihre Lehre und Wirkung.* Von K. DOCKHORN. (Kölner Anglistische Arbeiten, 29. Band.) x + 227 pp. Bochum-Langendreer: Verlag Heinrich Pöppinghaus. 1937. Price ? [A review will appear.]
- The Young Melbourne.* By LORD DAVID CECIL. Constable. 10s.
- Victorian Panorama.* By PETER QUENNEL. Batsford. 7s. 6d.
- Towards the Twentieth Century.* Essays in the Spiritual History of the Nineteenth. By H. V. ROUTH. Cambridge University Press. 21s.
- British History in the Nineteenth Century and After, 1782-1919.* By G. M. TREVELYAN. New Edition. Longmans. 12s. 6d.
- History of England.* By G. M. TREVELYAN. A new and enlarged edition. Longmans. 12s. 6d.
- A History of England.* By ANDRÉ MAUROIS. Translated by HAMISH MILES. Cape. 12s. 6d.
- The British Empire.* By C. F. MULLETT. x + 768 pp. London: Harrap. n.d. [1938]. 12s. 6d. [See Review, Febr. 1939.]
- Die Zukunft des Britischen Weltreichs.* Von R. HOOPS. (Schriftenreihe der Preussischen Jahrbücher, Heft 45.) 188 pp. Berlin: Stilke. 1937. Geb. RM. 5.50. [See Review, April 1938.]
- English Political Institutions.* By SIR JOHN A. R. MARRIOTT. Fourth Edition. Oxford: Clarendon Press. London: Milford. 5s.
- How England is Governed.* By the RT. HON. C. F. G. MASTERMAN, P.C. Revised and edited by DINGLE FOOT, M.P. Selwyn and Blount. 5s.
- Les Crises de la Morale et de la Moralité dans l'Histoire de la Civilisation et de la Littérature des Pays Anglo-Saxons.* Par PAUL YVON. Paris: Boivin. 20 f.
- Fair Play und der "Englische Sportgeist".* Von H. INDORF. (Britannica, 15.) 78 pp. Hamburg: Friederichsen, de Gruyter & Co. 1938. M. 3.—.
- The Dictionary of National Biography, 1922-1930.* Edited by J. R. H. WEAVER. With and Index for the years 1901-1930. Oxford University Press. London: Milford. 28s.
- The Concise Dictionary of National Biography.* From the Beginnings to 1930. 1648 pp. Oxford University Press. London: Milford. 1939. 21s.

'To Want' as an Auxiliary of Modality

It is a well-known fact that a considerably greater number of verbs may be used in the function of auxiliaries than are commonly included among this class¹. These supplementary auxiliaries range from now well-established constructions such as 'to be due' + inf.² to those confined to local usage such as 'to belong'³, to mention but a couple of the lesser-known. It appears, however, that even 'to want' belongs in this category of lesser-known supplementary auxiliaries although it is by no means of rare occurrence to-day. We might even say that it has been raised in our own days from dialectal flavour to the status of good colloquial not to say Standard English, which at any rate I have set out to demonstrate in the following article. What induces me to reckon it among the lesser-known auxiliaries is the fact that we scarcely find it mentioned in the grammars.

I

American Usage

To my knowledge only Curme⁴ gives it due place, when he notes in passing: "Sometimes other forms of expression, *need*, *want* (popular), *am obliged*, *am compelled*, etc., are employed to express this modal idea" (sc. volitive subjunctive): "'He need not wait'. 'You want to keep your eyes open in the city or you will be taken in'."⁵

After quoting from Curme we may conveniently begin by dealing with the American usage of 'to want', and with affirmative sentences in particular. Since Curme does not go into details nor differentiates between British and American usage it is as well to state here at the outset that the usage mentioned by Curme is good also in England. And as we shall see

¹ Cp. e.g. Kruisinga, *Handbook*, Part II, 1 (4th ed.) §§ 181 ff., and particularly § 602 ff.: 'It should be understood that the question whether a verb is to be counted among the auxiliaries is one of grammatical convenience' (§ 603).

² See Febr. issue, *E. S.*, p. 27, opening lines. Further examples: 'ten more minutes and she'd be due to meet Pip'; '(she) went straight through to Form Remove, where she was due to take first period' (from W. Holtby, *South Riding*, Albatross Ed., pp. 59 and 278 respectively); 'the exercises are due to finish to-morrow evening' (B.B.C.). The meaning is: 'have to', or 'will' (according to schedule, arrangement).

³ 'I belong to go' = 'I ought to go' (sc.: but I don't want to); used in North Carolina; see *Dialect Notes* V, 1918, p. 20.

⁴ *Syntax* (1931), p. 395.

⁵ Curme acknowledges his indebtedness to Krapp's *Comprehensive Guide to Good English* (1927), from which the sentence in question is taken over. The curious explanation given by Curme in parenthesis (= *need*) seems to have crept in by mistake, since Krapp correctly defines the meaning = 'ought, should'.

later on not only this use but all the other examples taken from British sources are 'permissible in the USA, being in daily use there' (see footnote 8). Thus British and American usage happen to coincide here, which is not surprising seeing they draw on the same dialectal heritage.

Indeed this everyday usage seems to have been first observed by American popular writers on linguistic matters. It will suffice to quote from one of these popular authors, Charles N. Lurie: *How to say it. Helpful Hints on English* (G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1926), who says on the subject of 'to want' as an auxiliary: "To want means to need, to desire, to lack, and it should not be used in the sense of 'ought' or 'had better', as in the case, 'You want to hurry if you are going to get to the city to-night'. Such use of the word 'want' is colloquial. In the case quoted, you should say, 'you had better hurry if you are going to the city to-night'. Or, if you desire to make the statement stronger, you may say, 'you must hurry' etc."

We have now to bear in mind two things: 1) the various tags attached to this usage by the different critics, and 2) the variety in the force of meaning attaching to it.

Ad 1) Both Lurie and Krapp (see footnote 5) call it 'colloquial', the latter adding, however, 'and dialectal' ('distinguishing for a particular geographical region or for a particular cultural level', according to his definition of the term 'dialectal'). Krapp may have hesitated to commit himself definitively to the term 'colloquial' and may therefore have added 'dialectal' (which is unquestionably correct) as an afterthought and saving clause. The latest-comer Curme, quoting from Krapp, may have had the same hesitations, but with him conservatism in speech seems to have overridden all other considerations so that he designated the use as 'popular'⁶. Now Curme may certainly be said to err on the side of conservatism, to put it mildly, when he relegates this usage to the speech of the 'common people'. As one American friend⁷ wrote me: "Regarding your query about the word 'want' as an auxiliary: This is proper and is in considerable use here, particularly in the North. For example, it is all right to say: 'You want to hurry' meaning 'You had better hurry'. The other sentences⁸ are correct also — or rather I might say they are permissible, being in daily use". This is the standpoint of the average modern educated American speaker of the younger generation. Thus I have no hesitation in adopting the old designation of Lurie. 'To want' as an auxiliary of modality is now good U.S. colloquial speech, and has no longer any connotation of dialect about it, at any rate in the North.

⁶ The language of 'the common people' is by Curme called 'popular speech' since the common grammatical term 'vulgar' has a 'disparaging meaning which arouses false conceptions' *Syntax*, p. VI).

⁷ Since Mr. Charles M. Kellogg (†) came from the South (Georgia) and spent many years in New York, he was well qualified to give his opinion on matters of American usage.

⁸ I had sent Mr. Kellogg a list of the British examples culled from '*Her Privates We*' (see under 11).

Ad 2) The meaning of 'to want' as an auxiliary of modality is correctly defined by both Krapp and Lurie as 'ought'; it has also the force of 'should' (Krapp) or 'had better' (Lurie, Mr. Kellogg); if the statement is made stronger, it is = 'must' (Lurie).

II

British Usage

In his *Glossary of Americanisms* (1931) H. Mutschmann lists our construction, thereby implying that he regards it as characteristic of the USA.⁹ This may be taken as a typical example of how little known the British usage of 'to want' as an auxiliary of modality was at that time in and outside Great Britain, where it was duly registered only in Wright's *Dialect Dictionary* (1905). If we disregard the somewhat forlorn and mystifying treatment accorded it by the NED (1928) we may say that it was generally regarded as pure dialect. This authority has the following entry (sub 'want' 4b): 'with *vbl. sb. or inf. (esp. passive)* as object (now chiefly *colloq.*)¹⁰. It wants doing (it wants to be done): it needs doing, should be done. *One wants to do it*¹⁰ (this way): one's best, or proper course is to do it; one *should*¹⁰ do it, etc.' There at last is our usage of 'to want' as an auxiliary of modality registered all right, but (mistakenly?) left without a single elucidating example! I had at first overlooked the second part of this entry and had come to the erroneous conclusion that up to the present both grammarians¹¹ and lexicographers (always excepting Wright) had elected to condemn it as unworthy of notice. It was only when consulting Wyld's *Universal Dictionary* (1932) that I became aware of my error and found the construction done full justice to by him.

The use of 'to want' with an active inf. ought to have an entry of its own. Although cognate, the constructions with *vbl. sb. or passive inf.*, in which the force of 'need', 'require' seems to have persisted to some extent, should be kept apart; besides they seem to be of younger growth than the construction with an active inf. Compared with the latter they have

⁹ He quotes the sentence (evidently from Krapp): 'you want to keep your eyes open in Chicago', and explains 'want to' = 'ought to'.

¹⁰ My italics.

¹¹ When Poutsma says: 'the inf.-constr. is, apparently, far less frequent' (sc. than the gerund constr. of the type: 'your hair wants cutting') 'and has transitive verbs in the passive voice when required by the sense' (Part I Second Half, 2nd ed., 1929, p. 870) he may not be under the influence of the NED. But he has obviously not come across a single example of 'to want' with an active inf. as an auxiliary of modality in 'late modern English', which is not surprising, since it was regarded as pure dialect in those days. (See also footnotes 13 and 18). — When H. W. Fowler finds fault with a sentence like the following: 'no man can say what is *wanted to be done* ...' (M.E.U., 1926) he condemns this 'ugly construction' merely for its double passive. We must conclude that he has not come across our usage in print either or he would have denounced it.

a distinctive flavour of polite or literary style about them, especially the construction with passive inf. Although the NED. gives various examples of this latter use from 1697 to 1791 I think it is generally avoided in the spoken language in favour of the constr. with an active inf. (see footnote 26, but also 13 and 18). This was already noticed in part by Poutsma (see footnote 11), who was of the opinion that it was 'far less frequent than the gerund-construction'. I should like to endorse his verdict, but add to it by saying that it is far and away less frequent than the constr. with the active inf. To my mind the passive inf.-constr. seems to be sometimes used as a kind of 'escapist' construction to avoid using the more popular gerund or active inf. Thus we come to a downright reversal of the NED.'s above-mentioned statement (first part). The entry in question ought to read: 'with *vbl. sb. or inf. (esp. active)* ...'. The proper course would be, as stated above, to split it up into two separate entries.

We shall now adduce more examples to prove our point and to make up for the shortage of pertinent quotations in the NED. Let us first return to the entries in Wright's *Dialect Dictionary*. We shall arrange his examples under different headings according to the sense, dealing *A* with affirmative and *B* with negative clauses. Both constructions seem to be of equal currency (see footnote 25).

*A a) = 'ought'*¹²: that little dish *wants to go down* into the dairy (Lin.); these yur drill *wants to be putt away* (nw. Dev.)¹³.

b) = 'must': which is the way? You *want to turn* to your left and go straight forard (w.Yks., Midl. Not.)¹⁴.

B a) = 'must not': you *don't want to break through* that hedge! (Suf.)¹⁵; you sit still, you *do not want to move* (Dev.); you *don't want to be telling* everybody. Her *don't want to bide* a minute arter they be a-come. (w.Som.)

b) = 'need not': 'You *don't want to do so*', you need not do so (Nrf.).

It is a far cry from Wright to Wyl d, whose examples we shall arrange as before.

¹² Wright gives the explanation for all the examples listed: 'to need; must, ought'. Perhaps *Aa)* and *b)* could be boiled down to 'should': cp. footnote 16.

¹³ This is the only example given by Wright of the constr. with passive inf.

¹⁴ Dr. Frederick T. Wood of Sheffield says that he has also heard it in Kent.

¹⁵ Wright registers this use for Suffolk; but Dr. Wood, who was good enough to enlighten me on this usage as on other occasions, thinks this is not confined to Suffolk but is to be found in all the districts of England. I have a suspicion that by now pretty well all the above sentences could be heard through the length and breadth of England.

In the opinion of Mr. H. R. Taylor (English lecturer at Jena University, 1938), whom I have also to thank for his valuable help, the examples from Wright 'seem to be a little unnatural, almost as if they had been made up rather than heard' — the sentence-flow does not seem right to him. "If, on the other hand, we amended the first example to 'you don't want to break through a hedge like that' it would sound much more natural and I should describe it as colloquial." Still I should be inclined to regard Wright's examples as genuine. Dialect has a different sentence flow from that of people who have been through secondary schools and universities, quite apart from the fact that e.g. Mr. Wood found no fault with the sentence as it stands.

- A a) = 'ought': one *wants to be* very careful in handling poisons¹⁶.
 b) = 'must': you *want to have* your teeth seen to¹⁶.
 B a) = 'must not': you *don't want to overdo* it for a bit.
 b) = 'need not': you *don't want to be* rude¹⁷; he *doesn't want to be* treated too severely¹⁸.

Mr. Wyld has indeed lived up to his promise 'to give . . . a picture of English usage at the present time'. The astonishing thing about these entries from the point I want to make is that a usage hitherto relegated to dialect dictionaries and the like has overnight become standard English, for Mr. Wyld does not attach any label to them, terming them neither 'colloquial', nor 'vulgar' or 'dialectal', etc. This change has been brought about in the course of one generation, under our very eyes, so to speak. If we split this period of roughly 25 years between the appearance of Wright's dictionary and Wyld's into two halves we find these halves beginning or ending with the Great War. What was dialect a dozen years before the war is dialect no longer a dozen years after, but recognized usage. The suggestion is pressed home on any observer, I think, that the levelling influence of the war may have been greatly responsible for this, and may have had its share in helping to spread this usage among those who till then had looked down upon it as dialect.

Let us now consult a well-known war-novel: *Her Privates We* (1930), in which there are quite a number of examples. We shall arrange them as before.

A a) = 'ought' ('had better', 'should'): 'if Jerry starts shellin' proper' said the corporal, 'you *want to take shelter* in them trenches' (p. 285)¹⁹.

b) = 'must': 'If Captain Marsden asks you anything about it, you *want to be sure, see?*'²⁰

B a) = 'must not': 'where do you reckon the sniper is?' 'In that building-rubbish', answered Bourne, without conviction. 'There's a heap of bricks left, where the chimney collapsed: that's where I think he is.' 'You *don't want to think,*' was Tozer's comment.²¹ 'If Captain M. asks you anything

¹⁶ Wyld lists both these sentences under *one* heading: 'to be so circumstanced that it is desirable to do (something specified); to be obliged to do; ought, must'. Indeed 'must' and 'ought' seem interchangeable in these two sentences. See footnotes 12 and 19. Perhaps it would be as well to lump together a) and b) under the heading 'should'.

¹⁷ as an alternative sense Wyld gives: 'you oughtn't to be rude'.

¹⁸ Wyld paraphrases this sentence with: 'he does not require . . .'. Note that this is another case of 'to want' with *passive inf.* (see footnote 13).

¹⁹ Whereas in German we should invariably use the auxiliary 'müssen', the English 'must' is more imperative, so that in this case Mr. Wood suggests 'I advise you to . . .' instead of 'must' as an additional periphrasis. He continues: "perhaps 'should' would be a better equivalent than 'must'." Mr. Taylor is also of the opinion that the force of 'want' is rather 'should' than 'must' in this case. He continues, however: "I admit that the difference between 'should' and 'must' in these clauses is very slight". See footnote 12, 16, ²⁰ for the context, see B a).

²¹ Tozer is the name of the sergeant-major.

about it, you want to be sure, see?' (p. 417). 'You don't want to think o' things,' he said with brutal kindness. 'It's all past an' done wi', now' (p. 405); 'you don't want to talk like that,' said Corporal Hamley (pp. 280, 281, 445).

b) = 'need not': 'you don't want to talk about it anyway',²² said Corporal Hamley, quietly ... 'there's no need to make a song about it' (p. 281); 'you don't want to get the bloody wind up, you know,' he said kindly (p. 379).

The author of the novel consistently puts these sentences in the mouths of uneducated speakers. Not a single time does he make either Bourne or an officer use them. This would imply that he either considers this usage confined to the lower classes, or that he goes out of his way meticulously to copy the speech of those days as opposed to that of to-day. As we suggested above, the conclusion seems plausible that during the war this usage was catching on owing to the continual contact of educated speakers among the soldiers with users of these phrases. The habit grew on educated speakers, so that by now they use them without being aware of it.²³

Since we have the unimpeachable testimony of Mr. Wyld nobody can deny that the use of 'to want' as an auxiliary of modality is now good colloquial English. Besides, Mr. Wood expressly designates it as such. He continues: "I myself do not like it altogether, but it is frequently used in conversation by quite educated people ..." Likewise Mr. Taylor writes²⁴: "I should be inclined to look upon it as colloquial". He adds: "I can easily make up examples in the positive"²⁵ (i.e. of the type A a, examples of which are indeed fairly numerous). "Here are two which occur to me at the moment: '*what you want to do* is to let your house and go away'; '*you want to go* to the Post Office and get it cashed'. Another example put forward by Mr. Wood is: 'if you like mountain scenery *you want to go to Wales*'. Here is another I came across recently: 'to see European affairs in their true perspective *you want to travel* to the farther end of the world'.²⁶ What finally convinced me (before I had seen the entries in Wyld) that this usage could no longer be regarded as in any

²² Here again, Mr. Taylor suggests: '*you should not, ought not to* talk about it'.

²³ As Mr. Wood writes: 'I rather suspect that, in spite of my conservative objection, I sometimes use it myself before I realise it, so accustomed have I become to hearing it used by people around me' (letter, 4.3.1938).

²⁴ letter, 6.4.1938.

²⁵ I was at first under the erroneous impression that sentences in the negative were more numerous. Both Mr. Taylor and Mr. Wood confirm that this usage of 'to want' is not confined to the negative. Mr. Wood writes 'I should say that it is merely a co-incidence that you have come across more examples in negative than in affirmative sentences'.

²⁶ Mr. Vernon Bartlett in *World Review*, April 1938, p. 9. These examples (even of the type Aa, which is fairly numerous) are as yet rather few and far between in English texts. It seems that people still fight shy of seeing such phrases stare them in the face in cold print.

way dialectal was the following example from a letter to the Times on the subject of Grey Squirrels, signed HALIFAX: 'the entrance *wants to be no larger* than to permit the grey squirrel to get in',²⁷ in which the force of 'want' is again rather 'should' than 'must', in the opinion of Mr. Taylor.

Nevertheless there are sure to be many people of conservative leanings in England (as well as in the USA., see above) who will still regard this usage as dialectal, particularly those of the older generation. We noticed that the author of the war-novel made his privates and nco.s only use these clauses. Mr. F. T. Wood frankly admits his displeasure at the usage, and while recognizing it reluctantly is positive on one thing: "the examples which mean 'must'" (evidently those of the type Ba meaning 'must not') "are definitely dialectal". He consequently includes among this verdict the sentence used by Lord Halifax dubbing it 'one of his aberrations',²⁸ just as an American linguist of the younger generation who holds strong views on questions of propriety in speech was shocked to hear what clause Lord H. had been guilty of. Perhaps Lord H. did use a construction he had picked up in the countryside, and had no qualms in using it. Be that as it may, we must consider that clause and similar ones of the type Ba 'colloquial' on the unambiguous testimony of both Mr. Wyld (see above) and Mr. Taylor²⁹ (see footnote 15).

To sum up: the use of 'to want' as an auxiliary (both of the type A and B) must be regarded as good colloquial both in the USA. and Great Britain. The various meanings attaching to it might be reduced to those of 'should' (A), and 'should not' (B), as already suggested in the NED.

One word more in conclusion about the sense-development. Mr. Wood suggested that the gerund constructions 'my coat wants mending', 'the pencil wants sharpening', etc. should be compared with our usage. "By a kind of twisting of these constructions people arrive at the sentences 'you want to sharpen your pencil', 'you want to mend your coat', etc." The gerund-construction will naturally suggest itself to an educated speaker, but not necessarily to the man in the street. 'To want' + inf. may be as

²⁷ It is perhaps as well to print the whole paragraph in which the example occurs. Here it is: 'In recent years we here have shot between two and three hundred grey squirrels a year, but during the last fortnight I have, on the advice of a friend, started trapping them. We have tried two sorts of traps. The first, a trap baited with Indian corn, set inside a small palisade of stakes built round a small tree, rather in the shape of an old-fashioned beehive. The entrance ... (as above). The other trap is a cage of plain inch-mesh wire ...' (letter to the Times, dated Sept. 3, 1937).

²⁸ 'we might, perhaps, contend that 'wants to be no larger' has some such meaning as 'I advise that it be no larger' but I am even doubtful about that' (Mr. F. T. Wood).

²⁹ Mr. Taylor writes: 'It is perhaps true that the use of 'want' as an auxiliary began as a dialectal feature, but without definite evidence I should hesitate to ascribe it to any regional dialect of the present day. If it is now at all dialectal, then it must belong to a class dialect. I should, therefore, be inclined to look upon it as colloquial'.

old or even older than the gerund-constr. Mr. Taylor is perhaps nearer to the truth when he says: "the sense development seems to be through 'want' = 'the best thing for you to do is to...' (i.e. need, your necessity is ...), which can easily be traced back to that earlier meaning of the verb 'to want'." I should think the original meaning underlying the clauses in question is 'to stand in need of' (something salutary, but often not desired).³⁰ Our construction might directly be traced back to the old verb listed by the NED. sub 'want' v. 1 *intr.*, which was in early use construed with the dative: 'you want to hurry' = 'dir fehlt, dass du dich beeilst' in German, just as the cognate 'your hair wants cutting' would correspond to the German 'deinem Haar fehlt das Schneiden'. Thus we see that our usage is probably of very old and time-honoured standing.

Very likely it serves another purpose, too. Curme has rightly drawn attention to the fact that 'ought' and 'must' do not now have alongside of them a past indicative or a present indicative or subjunctive. "The common people often replace the unclear old past subjunctive 'ought' by a clear modern past subjunctive, employing the past subjunctive auxiliaries 'should', 'had', or 'did': 'A woman should ought to be modest'; 'she didn't ought to have done it'. To convey greater assurance the common people place the present tense 'do' before the old past subjunctive 'ought', and have thus created a new present subjunctive form: 'He don't ought to go' ..." ³¹ Curme might have added 'to want' as another example, just as 'I belong to go' = 'ought to go' belongs in the same category.

Jena.

G. KIRCHNER.

³⁰ NED. sub 'want' v. 4.

³¹ *Syntax*, p. 414.

Notes and News

Milton's Retirement to Horton and Renaissance Literary Theory

The general reasons for Milton's retirement to Horton after his Cambridge days are well known and have been admirably stated by Milton's biographers. That Renaissance literary theory, particularly the doctrine that great learning is essential to great poetry, had something to do with the course he adopted is generally recognized. But it has not been suggested, I believe, that another Renaissance theory regarding the poet's career was probably an equally important element in his decision. I refer to the theory that courts and cities with their noise and confusion were inimical to poetry, and the retirement to quiet and secluded places in the country was essential for the pursuance of great poetical designs. That a very definite theory of this sort existed can be easily demonstrated. Boccaccio devotes a whole section to it in his treatment of poetry in the *Genealogia Deorum Gentilium*,¹ and as Osgood has pointed out, it is a common theme in Petrarch.² Boccaccio states it succinctly as follows:

But these mutterers are probably not aware that poets have sought and still seek their habitation in solitudes because contemplation of things divine is utterly impossible in places like the greedy and mercenary market, in courts, theatres, offices, or public squares, amid crowds of jostling citizens and women of the town. Yet unless such contemplation is practically uninterrupted, the poet can neither conceive his works, nor complete them.³

That these ideas had a classical origin, partly in classical precedent and partly in classical example, is clear. Quintilian refers to them as common notions in his time,⁴ and Boccaccio and Petrarch both cite Horace's recommendations in his *Second Epode*.⁵ Later in the Renaissance we find Vida incorporating the theory in his *Art of Poetry*:

For what remains: the poet I enjoin
To form no glorious scheme, no great design,
Till, free from business, he retires alone,
And flies the giddy tumult of the town.⁶

It is perhaps impossible to prove that Milton's decision to retire to Horton was motivated by the specific Renaissance theory which my quotations embody, but when we take into consideration the many ways in which he was admittedly and obviously influenced by Renaissance literary theory, it is difficult not to believe that it was at least a contributing element in his

¹ Ch. XIV, sec. 11 (pp. 54-58 in Osgood's *Boccaccio on Poetry*).

² *Op. cit.*, p. 168.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 55.

⁴ *Inst. Orat.*, X, iii, 22 ff.

⁵ Osgood, pp. 55-56 and 169.

⁶ Bk. I, ll. 486 ff. I quote Pitt's translation in *The Art of Poetry*, ed. A. S. Cook (Boston, 1892), p. 71.

decision. Indeed, in *Comus*, in lines the general autobiographical significance of which in regard to Horton has been pointed out by nearly all commentators, Milton comes very close to stating the theory:

And Wisdoms self
 Off seeks to sweet retired Solitude,
 Where with her best nurse Contemplation
 She plumes her feathers, and lets grow her wings
 That in the various bussle of resort
 Were all to ruffl'd, and sometimes impair'd.⁷

It is true that what Milton says is said of wisdom, but insofar as the passage is autobiographically significant, it is certainly wisdom in the service of poetry that he is thinking of, and hence poetry itself.

Northwestern University,
 Evanston, Illinois.

Z. S. FINK.

More War Words. We offer no apology for printing yet another series of notes on war words, this time from a further collection sent in by Miss A. M. Rekkers, of Flushing, soon after the appearance of our June number. Apart from their topical interest these extracts, like those in the earlier instalments, are sure to be of value to future lexicographers and other students of twentieth-century English.

a. Our supposition that the word *evacuee* may have been in use some time before the outbreak of war is still awaiting confirmation; but Miss R. has noted several instances of *evacuation* and *to evacuate*, in their present meaning, in the Daily Telegraph of July 18, 1939.

The flexibility of the English language is well illustrated by the following extracts from *The Listener*, Nov. 30, 1939: "Let me show you into the typical *evacuee caravan* inhabited by my wife and myself, though I'm afraid we can't claim to be real *evacuee caravanners* because we have lived in our home for nearly two years." "I do advise would-be *caravanner evacuees* to get a good solid living van." Both the latter word-groups occur twice in the article. The writer also tells us that "another friend has *caravan-evacuated* his wife and children to North Wales."

We may add that according to (Dutch) newspapers 'evacuees' are now being followed by 'escapists' — those who are leaving England before the threat of German invasion. The word is not in either the OED, its Supplement or Ten Bruggencate's dictionary, though we think it used to be current in the combination 'escapist literature', in the sense of 'providing

⁷ Ll. 374-79.

an escape from reality.' This, and a perhaps unconscious objection to a rhyme with 'evacuee', may have led to the avoidance of the existing word 'escapee', recorded in the OED and Supplement from 1865 (Walt Whitman) to 1884 (Manchester Guardian). That the latter word is by no means obsolete appears from the following quotation from Current Literature, Jan. 1940: "Ernst Toller, who was also a Nazi escapee, had written another play before his death."

b. *Billeted* (past part.) and *billeting* (gerund), in their present meaning, also occur in the number of the Daily Telegraph mentioned above. The following quotation from The Star, Nov. 1, 1939, is of interest: "This business of billeting has been accepted with admirable resignation by the 'billetors', an official term which will no doubt move Mr. A. P. Herbert¹ to indict the Government for adding to the horrors of war. These northern householders feel that they have to have someone, and they call us the 'inevitables.' Indeed, there are 'billetors' who have received their *billetees* with enthusiasm,"

c. *Black-out*, in its present meaning, was, of course, in use before the war, but it is worth noting that a writer in the Daily Telegraph of July 21, 1939, still put it between inverted commas. Interesting, too, (from more than one point of view) is what an American journalist, just back from Berlin, said before the B.B.C. microphone, according to The Listener of March 21, 1940, p. 586: "I must report that Berlin has London definitely *out-blacked*" — and: "For you English must admit that the Germans not only have you out-blacked, but they also have you out-glowered, for whatever that may be worth."

There are two more uses of 'black out' among Miss Rekkers' materials, both of them connected with the war. The Illustrated London News of April 6, 1940, p. 449, describes what happens when an aeroplane turns at high speed:

Centrifugal force, known technically as "G," decrees that the average human cannot turn at a speed above "6 G" (i.e., six times the equivalent of gravity). Then the pilot, as he turns with his machine banked and his head inwards to the turn, feels the effect of centrifugal force jamming him down in his seat. The blood in his head seeks to fly outwards, and, as his body and feet are away from the centre of the turn, runs towards his legs and drains from behind his eyes, so that he becomes temporarily blind, or "*blacks out*." That pilot's "*black-out*" is no mere question of theory is shown by the account, published on March 31, of a pilot-sergeant on the Western Front who, after suffering thus through turning too quickly, ...

Lastly, there is 'to black out' in its primary meaning, as when the News Bulletin of April 22 told of a German aeroplane being interned in Switzerland, while "caricatures of Mr. Churchill (on the plane) have been blacked out."

d. Before coming to technical words, another enlightening example of the use of *siren suit*: "These 'Ku-Klux-Klan' models — "*siren suits*" the

¹ Cf. the June number of *E. S.*, p. 116.

West End stores call them — are of wool and have trousers, jacket and hood in one piece." (Daily Express, Sept. 25, 1939.)

The remainder of Miss Rekkers' neologisms may be conveniently divided into those recorded in the Supplement to the OED, and therefore in existence before 1933, and those not found there. To the former belong *slipstream* (of aeroplane), *tracer* (bullet), *aero-engine*, *flaming onions* (acc. to the Suppl. 'a flaming rocket'; acc. to Ill. London News, March 30, 1940, 'a type of incendiary A-A² shell'; on the photograph they appear tied together like a string of onions), *submariners*, *soaring flight* and *soaring pilots*; also *hand-outs* (of news), *banjolele* and *go-slow strike*. Sometimes a quotation usefully supplements a definition or example in the Supplement. Thus the latter has: "Contact, v. Add: 3. *trans.* To get into contact or touch with (persons). U.S." — a definition that will have to be revised in the light of the following quotation from Flight, March 7, 1940: "The nearest most of us get to such an entrancing spectacle is coloured light before the eyes when we contact the garden gate with our eyebrow when letting the dog out last thing at night." (The reference is to fireworks.)

Among words not registered in the Supplement are *crashproof* (said of an aeroplane, Ill. L. News, Febr. 10, 1940), *arrester wires* ("designed to pull up aeroplanes landing in the 'Ark Royal'," *ibid.*, March 30, 1940), *de-Gaussing girdle* or *de-Gaussing cable* (under photo of Queen Elizabeth, Ill. L. News, March 16, 1940: "The anti-magnetic mine 'de-Gaussing-girdle' appears round the top of her hull." — with the explanation: "'Gauss' is the term in physics for the unit of electric flux." — In the number of March 30: "Sailors at work painting the 'De-Gaussing cable' fitted round a collier."), *teleprinter* ("It is thought that telephone and teleprinter lines were needed by the military authorities in Holland", B.B.C. News Bulletin, May 7, 1940). *Wave-bombing* and *dive-bombing* occur in the Ill. L. News of March 30, 1940. Under a photo of a destroyer in rough weather: "The footway, too, is *non-slip*" (I.L.N., Febr. 17, 1940). Automatic crewless lightships are officially known as *floats* (I.L.N., April 6, 1940). *Radiogenic* ("His script ... was so 'radiogenic' that it would not look its best in print: it was made to take the air", The Listener, April 11, 1940) and *radiosondage* (the word agreed upon internationally for the method of investigating the upper atmosphere by sending up small balloons with a small short-wave wireless set attached to them, I.L.N. March 23, 1940) seem to be recent formations too.

The following quotation from The Listener, April 25, 1940, is particularly valuable:

At the back of the bridge [sc. of a destroyer], 'Torps', the Torpedo Officer, and 'Guns', the Gunnery Officer, continue the unending argument of 'mouldies' versus 'bricks'. I must explain that in the Navy, torpedoes for some unknown reason are always referred to as 'mouldies' and shells as 'bricks'.

² Presumably 'anti-aircraft'.

'Mouldies', for torpedoes, is in the OED (Supplement; earliest quotation 1920), 'bricks', for shells, is not. But the interest of the quotation does not end there. 'Torps' and 'Guns', neither of them in the Oxford Dictionary, are examples of a type of nicknames and pet-names to which attention was called last year by Thielke in *Englische Studien*, 73, 2, 315-316. Thielke instances *Dads* and *Mums* for father and mother, *Boodleums* for Boodle (a dog's name), *ducks* for duck or ducky, *Wedders* for Wedderburn, besides arbitrary formations like *Clumps*, *Biffs* and *Boots*. I may add that I remember an Englishman in 1915 affectionately addressing a friend of his as '*Bottles*', perhaps because of the convivial connotation of the word. — This type of word-formation seems to have escaped the notice of lexicographers and grammarians hitherto.

In conclusion, a number of abbreviations collected by Miss Rekkers: A.I.F. = Australian Imperial Force; D.R. = Dispatch Rider; Ensa = Entertainment National Service Association; Narpac = National A.R.P. for Animals Committee; V.P. = vulnerable point; WAAF = Women Auxiliary Air Force; Wrens = members of Women's Royal Naval Service.

A.R.P. (in the 13th ed. of Ten Bruggencate, but not yet in the OED Supplement) of course stands for Air Raid Precaution. — Z.

Reviews

A Dictionary of the Low Dutch Element in the English Vocabulary. By J. F. BENSE. Part III—V (Keelful-Zwart). Den Haag (Nijhoff), 1932—1939.

De eerste aflevering van Bense's *Dictionary* verscheen in 1926 en werd in dit tijdschrift aangekondigd (IX, 183 vlgg.), de tweede in 1929 (vgl. *E. St.* XIII, 124 vgl.). Met regelmatige tussenpozen zijn de overige drie uitgekomen. Zo is er thans gelegenheid om de hele publicatie te overzien, in het bijzonder naar aanleiding van de laatste drie afleveringen, die trouwens in omvang meer dan drie vierden van het hele boek beslaan.

Het eigenlijke woordenboek, buiten „Introduction” en „List of Books referred to”, omvat niet minder dan 637 bladzijden in twee fijn bedrukte kolommen, groot octavo. Louter op deze omvang afgaande zou men kunnen denken dat het Engels van nederlandse (en nederduitse) leenwoorden wemelde. Zo erg is het echter niet.

In de eerste plaats neemt B. veel woorden op, waarvan hij zelf na discussie de ontlening onzeker of onwaarschijnlijk acht. Ten tweede zijn veel van de

Noot. Op verzoek van den recensent in het Nederlands opgenomen. — Red.

hier gesignaleerde woorden in de Engelse literatuur hapax legomena. Zulke hapaxen komen b.v. veel voor onder de *Reinaert*-woorden bij Caxton. Ten derde is het de moeite waard op te merken dat een aanzienlijk deel van de behandelde woorden alleen gangbaar of althans opgetekend is in Zuid-Afrika, waar de aanraking tussen Nederlands en Engels levendig is. — Voorts wordt Bense's materiaal zeer vermeerderd doordat hij in het Engels gevormde samenstellingen met een — erkend of vermoed — leenwoord onder afzonderlijke artikels behandelt: zie b.v. de talrijke samenstellingen met *pick-* en *rock-*. Ook samenstellingen, waarvan geen der delen is ontleend, waar die naar ndl. of ndd. voorbeeld kunnen zijn gevormd, vinden hun plaats onder het „Low Dutch Element”, zoals *night-piece* naar *nacht-tuk*, *side-door* naar *zijdeur*, *silver-work* naar *zilverwerk*; tot deze groep behoren o.a. verscheiden samenstellingen met *pepper-*, *rape-*, *sea-*, *ship-*, *water-*, *wine-*. Voorts staan ook in de lijst geografische namen en afleidingen van nederlandse persoonsnamen als *Rhineland*, *Rembrandtesque*, *Rooseveltian*, *Rooseveltism*, *Rubenesque*, *Schiedam* ('a variety of gin'). De aanduiding „nederlandse” behoeft bij de persoonsnamen niet zeer eng te worden opgevat, getuige *Spinozan*, *Spinozism* e.d. De namen zelf schijnen alleen dan opgenomen te zijn, wanneer zij verengelst zijn, zoals *Owl-glass* naar *Uilenspiegel*; *Utrecht* en *Walcheren* hebben een plaats gekregen, omdat zij in verbindingen voorkomen als *Utrecht velvet*, *Walcheren fever*.

Een voorname oorzaak van de grote omvang is de reeds vroeger met waardering vermelde uitvoerigheid, waarmee de auteur pro en contra tegen elkaar afweegt. De artikels in de latere afleveringen zijn in dit opzicht nog royaler opgezet dan in de eerste twee.

Ook bij het raadplegen van literatuur heeft Dr. Bense geen moeite ontzien: een lijst van niet minder dan 23 bladzijden toont dat hij, behalve de N.E.D. die hij op de voet volgt, heel wat onder de ogen heeft gehad. In deze lijst zijn de nederlandse werken niet alle up to date. Stoett's *Spreekwoorden* komt er op voor in een druk van 1901, Vercoullie's *Etymol. Wdb.* in de 2e druk van 1898; ernstiger schijnt het mij dat De Bo's *West-vlaamsch Idioticon*, een lexicografisch werk dat B. dikwijls citeert, slechts in de 1e druk van 1873 is gebruikt. Ook heeft Dr. B. niet altijd de gelegenheid gevonden om continentale literatuur te verwerken die gedurende de publicatie van zijn werk is uitgekomen. Zo zou ik gaarne in de literatuurlijst vermeld hebben gezien M. Valkhoff's *Mots français d'origine néerlandaise* (1931), niet alleen omdat het een soortgelijke studie is als die van Dr. B., maar ook omdat het bij de discussie van sommige woorden had gebruikt kunnen worden: ik noem *to mute* < ofr. *muetir* < *esmeutir* < ndl. *smelten*, en het s.v. *poach* besproken ofr. *pochier*. Verder mis ik in de lijst het *Mittelniederdeutsche(s) Handwörterbuch* van Lasch en Borchling (sedert 1928), dat wel beknopter is, maar veel meer woordmateriaal verwerkt dan Schiller en Lübben. Ik houd het er voor dat systematische raadpleging van dit helaas traag verschijnende woordenboek voor de eerste letters van het alfabet menige aanvulling of verbetering zou hebben gebracht.

Men kan het niet als een leemte beschouwen, dat grammatische werken

over het Middelnederlands (Franck) en het Middelnederduits (Lasch; Sarauw) in de lijst ontbreken. Toch blijkt nu en dan in kwesties van historische klankleer, dat B. geen Neerlandicus van professie is. Zo geldt bij *landloper* de spelling met *o* van het *Mnl. Wdb.* tegenover Kiliaan's *-looper* mee als argument voor ontlening in de middeleeuwse periode. Maar Verdam past in zijn titelwoorden het onderscheid tussen *o* en *oo* niet toe; een blik op het artikel *loper(e)* had trouwens Dr. B. kunnen overtuigen dat spellingen met *oo* ook in de middeleeuwen vaak genoeg voorkomen. — Als ik B. bij *lantscape* goed begrijp, acht hij dit wegens de *-sc-* ontleend aan gesproken *Mnl.*; hij citeert daarvoor de vorm *lantscap* uit 1326. Men krijgt de indruk dat B. *mnl. sc* als voorstelling van [sk] opvat. Zo laat hij ook bij *scone* en elders *mnd. sch-* leiden tot eng. *sh-*, maar *mnl. sc-* tot eng. *sc-*. Blijkbaar gaat hij voor *mnd. sch-* uit van een klankwaarde [š], die op zijn minst zeer onzeker is. Integendeel is er voor het latere Middelnederduits veel meer reden om [sk] aan te nemen, zoals die in veel nederduitse dialecten tot heden voortbestaat, dan voor het westelijke Middelnederlands. — Bij *rover* 'pirate' heeft de auteur zich te veel op het toevallige woordenboekmateriaal verlaten, als hij meent dat *rovere* geen *mnd.* vorm is. — Zulke klankhistorische finesses hebben echter bij een onderzoek als dat van Dr. Bense slechts een ondergeschikte betekenis. Van meer belang is het zuivere nederlandse taalgevoel, dat den geboren Nederlander, vooral bij de behandeling van nieuwnederlandse woorden en uitdrukkingen, vaak de juiste weg wijst.

Men krijgt bij het doorlezen van dit degelijke werk de overtuiging dat weinig nederlandse of nederduitse woorden door de nauwe mazen van Bense's strak gespannen net zijn ontsnapt. Er zijn er zelfs heel wat onder, die ik als visjes beneden de maat van waarschijnlijkheid gaarne zou vrijlaten. Vaak voel ik sterk de bezwaren mee, die B. met een „though...” inleidt, maar niet altijd kan ik die bezwaren zo gemakkelijk opheffen als de auteur doet met het bevrijdende „yet...” dat gewoonlijk op zulk een „though” volgt. Het zou te ver voeren dit door een bespreking van artikel voor artikel te illustreren. Liever wil ik trachten enkele algemene trekken in B.'s behandeling der stof aan te wijzen, waarmee men rekening moet houden, wil men de intensiteit van de „Low Dutch” invloed op het engelse vocabularium op de juiste waarde schatten.

Ik wijs dan in de eerste plaats op internationale woorden zoals *palankeen* (*palanquin*), *piccadill*, *pill*, *potass*. De kronkel- en kruiswegen, waarlangs zulke woorden gaan, weet B. dikwijls zo te ontwarren, dat de weg naar het Engels via het Nederlands loopt. Heeft een frans woord van nederlandse oorsprong, zoals *pint*, *quail*, *scallop* zijn weg naar het Engels gevonden, dan geldt dat mede als ontlening uit het Nederlands. En niet zelden heet een frans woord dat ook in het Ndl. voorkomt, via het Ndl. in het Engels te zijn gekomen, zoals *pocket*, of althans onder *ndl.* invloed te zijn vervormd, zoals de noordelijke vormen *rym*, *rim* (15e en 16e eeuw) van *ream* 'a quantity of paper'. Lang niet alle voorbeelden van deze soort

zijn zo aannemelijk als *to pickeer* 'to maraud; to rout' dat aan fr. *picorer* is ontleend, maar de invloed van ndl. *pikeren* heeft ondergaan.

Ook bij de maleise en javaanse woorden ben ik niet altijd even vast overtuigd als B., dat zij via het Ndl. in het Engels zijn gekomen. Aan de mogelijkheid van directe ontlending of ontlending via het Portugees heeft Dr. Bense m.i. te weinig aandacht geschonken. Bij woorden als *pisang*, *proa-prahu* (naast de meer nederlands aandoende vormen *prau*, *praw*) 'a kind of vessel', *rotang*, *sago*, *seladang* 'gaur, tapir' is ontlending via het Nederlands niet voldoende gewaarborgd. Waarschijnlijker is dit verloop bij *sambal* 'a Malay spiced condiment'. Hoe gecompliceerd de toestand zijn kan, blijkt uit het geval *sirih* 'a tropical shrub, the leaves of which are valued for chewing'. Het oudste voorbeeld door N.E.D. geciteerd is van 1866. Bense wijst nu een voorbeeld aan van 1598 uit een vertaling van Van Linschoten's *Itinerario*. Zolang echter het woord tussen 1598 en 1866 niet is gevonden, blijft het mogelijk dat het na Linschoten geen opgang heeft gemaakt en in de 19e eeuw opnieuw is ontleend, ditmaal rechtstreeks; in ieder geval is het voorbarig te zeggen dat het modern-engelse woord „has reached English through Dutch.”

Een gewichtig argument voor ontlending is de datering. Van dit chronologisch criterium maakt de auteur meermalen een zeer soepel gebruik. Is het oudste gewag in N.E.D. van de 16e en 17e eeuw, een periode van levendige aanrakingen tussen Nederlands en Engels, dan is de datering gewoonlijk al voldoende om ndl. oorsprong aan te nemen. Is een woord eerst later opgetekend, zoals *prad* 'horse', dan is de datering van minder gewicht, en het woord moet ouder zijn in het Engels dan de overlevering zou doen denken. Als omgekeerd *rorer* 'a disturber of the peace' reeds 1311 voorkomt, moet het ook op dat tijdstip in het Ndl. hebben bestaan, al is een **roerer* uit de woordenboeken niet bekend. Voor de scheepsterm *reef* wordt oudnoordse herkomst verworpen, omdat het te laat in het Engels verschijnt. Evenzo voor het in alle germaanse talen verbreide *rock* 'distaff': het "appears too late to be either a native Engl. word or a borrowing from O.N." Ik wil niet de juistheid van B.'s mening ten aanzien van juist dit woord betwisten, maar toch er op wijzen dat een vanouds engels woord zeer wel in de oudengelse overlevering kan ontbreken en eerst in het Middelenengels verschijnen.

Omgekeerd is B., wanneer hij hiermee winst voor het Ndl. kan boeken, wel eens wat vlug met de hypothese dat een oudeng. woord "has not survived", ook al komt het al vrij vroeg in de middelengelse periode voor. Dat zijn dan woorden die formeel zowel verwant met het nederlandse als daaraan ontleend kunnen zijn. Heeft zulk een woord "not survived", dan komt ontlending in aanmerking. Een voorbeeld van zulk een „annexatie" niettegenstaande het oudengelse verleden is *school* 'shoal': het eerst voor de hand liggende is hier ongetwijfeld rechtstreekse voortzetting van oeng. *scolu*. En over *to rase* 'to rage', dat sedert de 14e eeuw voorkomt, zou ik mij met meer voorbehoud uitspreken dan B. doet, temeer omdat de mnl. voorbeelden niet van de oudste zijn.

Een engels woord, dat volgens de gegevens van het *Mnl. Wdb.* een halve eeuw later voorkomt dan het nederlandse, wordt licht als ontlening uit het Ndl. verklaard, wanneer daartegen geen formeel bezwaar is. De nederlandse lezer wordt daarbij soms verontrust door de waarschuwing van een kenner der mnl. handschriften als W. de Vreese, die zich *Hand. Mij. d. Ned. Lettk.* 1932/33 wel zeer achterdochtig betoont tegenover de dateringen van het *Mnd. Wdb.*, en zó ver gaat te beweren dat wij geen enkele chronologische waarborg hebben vóór 1350. Men mag De Vreese's voorstelling van zaken wat somber achten, en overtuigd blijven dat het *Mnl. Wdb.* de autoriteit is voor allen die zich met lexicologische studie van het Middelnederlands bezighouden — toch waarschuwt het geluid van De Vreese's alarmklok tegen een te gemakkelijk concluderen tot historische afhankelijkheid uit historische opeenvolging die uitsluitend uit woordenboek-gegevens is afgeleid.

Boven is al opgemerkt, dat B. ook in zijn overzicht betreft samengestelde woorden, die wel uit zuiver engelse elementen bestaan, maar naar het voorbeeld van ndl. samenstellingen kunnen zijn gevormd. Wie handelt over "the Low Dutch Element" en niet specifiek over "Low Dutch Loan-Words" in het Engels, zou inderdaad verkeerd doen, als hij deze groep stilzwijgend voorbijging. Ik geloof echter, dat B. wel eens de lenigheid in woordformatie, kenmerk van het bij uitstek praktische Engels, wat laag aanslaat. Zou b.v. voor het maken van composita als *pisspot* en *potearth* 'potter's clay' ndl. invloed nodig zijn geweest? Zulk een vraag is de lezer nog meer geneigd te stellen, wanneer hij in de *Dictionary* als ontleend of nagemaakt samenstellingen aantreft als *palingman*, *packsaddle*, *packthread*, waarvan het ndl. voorbeeld in het geheel niet in woordenboeken is opgetekend. Vele lezers zullen ook verrast zijn, wanneer zij enige tientallen kolommen gevuld zien met *un*-composita, die veelal naar ndl. voorbeeld zouden zijn gevormd. Er zijn er verscheidene bij met een romaans tweede lid, zoals *unacceptably*, *unavenged*, enz. enz. Ook al zijn deze woorden het eerst uit Hexham's woordenboek opgetekend — dit is met een groot aantal het geval —, dan doet men de zelfstandigheid van het Engels in woordvormende kracht te kort, als men voor zulke formaties het ndl. voorbeeld verantwoordelijk stelt. Dat er ook woorden tussendoor lopen waar het Ndl. *ont*- heeft zoals to *unhalter*, *unhorse*, *unweapon*, maakt die ndl. invloed niet waarschijnlijker. De alfabetische volgorde brengt ook enige woorden met *under*- in de *un*-kolommen. Daarvan geldt dezelfde opmerking als van die met *un*-. Ter illustratie diene een lakonieke conclusie als deze betreffende het verouderde *under-admiral*: "as this word occurs later than its e. mod. Du. equivalent, we think it very probable that it is ad. [-aptation of] e. mod. Du."

Zeer subtiel wordt soms B.'s argumentatie, wanneer hij de mogelijkheid van nederlandse herkomst nagaat bij woorden die met suffixen zijn afgeleid. Van *the Netherlands* zou volgens den auteur geen *-ish*-adjectief kunnen zijn gevormd: derhalve is *Netherlandish* waarschijnlijk naar *Nederlands* gemaakt. Menig lezer zal minder belang hechten dan B. aan de kwestie,

of eng. *morassy* een engelse afleiding is van eng. *morass* < ndl. *moeras*, dan wel of het in zijn geheel ontleend is uit *moerassig*.

Hierbij sluiten zich aan de gevallen van denominatieve verba. De vorming hiervan gaat in het Engels wel zo gemakkelijk toe dat men zelden hulp van buiten hoeft in te roepen. Dr. B. echter acht dikwijls deze hulp onontbeerlijk. Zo zou *to school* naar ndl. *scholen* gevormd zijn en niet van eng. *school*, hoewel de chronologie deze hypothese niet steunt: ndl. *scholen* is later opgetekend dan het engelse werkwoord. *To sconce* wordt uit het Ndl. afgeleid, omdat het op de oudste engelse bewijsplaats een *b eschansen* van v. Linschoten weergeeft. Met zeer subtiele argumenten wordt verder *to scum* uit ndl. *schuimen* afgeleid. De alfabetische nabuurschap van deze drie woorden is geen toeval: de gevallen zijn overtalrijk in het Engels, dat „hetzelfde woord” en als nomen en als verbum voorkomt, en ook bij de (mogelijk of waarschijnlijk of zeker) ontleende nomina sluit zich vaak een verbum aan.

In dezelfde nabuurschap blijvend, merken we op dat *to scoop* gedifferentieerd wordt. In de meeste bett. erkent B. het met *N.E.D.* als een eng. vorming bij het substantief *scoop*, in de bet. 'to bail out (water)' echter is het naar het Nederlands gemaakt.

Een dergelijke differentiatie vindt ook herhaaldelijk plaats bij andere soorten van woorden. Met een eigenaardig gemak worden soms woorden in „sense 1” afgeleid uit het Mnl., in „sense 2 and 3” uit het Mnd., zoals bij *slap* 'opening in wall etc.'; *to slite* is in twee bett. voortzetting van oeng. *slitan*, in een andere bet. berust het op ontleening uit het Ndl. Ik wil alweer niet zeggen dat al deze verklaringen onjuist zijn, maar wel in het algemeen een kritische houding aanbevelen tegen deze schematische woordstambomen.

Verwant hiermee is de neiging van Dr. Bense, om een betekenisontwikkeling bij een engels woord, die zeer wel onafhankelijk kan hebben plaats gehad, toe te schrijven aan invloed van het corresponderende nederlandse woord. Niet ieder zal onmiddellijk aan ndl. invloed denken als het substantief *rand* de betekenis 'a strip of leather placed under the quarters of a boot or shoe' heeft ontwikkeld, ook al dreven "numbers of Flemish shoemakers ... their trade in England." Evenmin maken de Hollandse tuinlieden in Kent het nodig om voor de bet. 'turnip' van het verouderde dial. woord *knoll* ndl. invloed aan te nemen.

Niet alleen in de semantische, maar ook in de formele ontwikkeling van een woord ziet B. soms ndl. invloed, waar men die niet terstond vermoedt. Wie het amerikaanse *siss* naast *sister* ziet, zal dit allicht opvatten als een hypocoristische verkorting van een verwantschapsnaam, een verschijnsel dat in velerlei talen bekend is. Maar volgens B. zou ndl. *zus* hierbij het voorbeeld zijn geweest. Dat het Engels ook zelfstandig iets kan in deze richting, bewijst *sissy*, en niemand zal wel zo ver willen gaan dat hij ndl. *zussie* hiervoor verantwoordelijk stelt.

In aansluiting aan *E. S. IX. 185*, zij hier ten slotte nog eens gewezen op de woorden die het uiterlijk hebben van onomatopeeën, hetzij dat zij

het van oorsprong zijn, hetzij dat men er secundair klanksymboliek in heeft gevoeld. Meer dan Bense gedaan heeft, zou ik willen rekenen met onafhankelijke vorming, resp. vervorming in beide talen. Voor ontlening van *klop* en *to klop* is geen historische waarschijnlijkheid aan te voeren. Overneming van woorden met zulke betekenis en vorm zou wel een zeer intense invloed van het Nederlands op het Engels veronderstellen. Zulk een geval is ook het ww. *klutsen*. Er zijn ook met *l-* beginnende woorden, waarmee men bij het historisch onderzoek voorzichtig moet zijn, als *lab*, *labber*, *lobb*, *lubber* e.d. Ook het type *slab*, *slirt*, *slobber* vertoont een „anlaut” met klanksymbolische waarde, die in genen dele behoeft overgenomen te zijn. In dezelfde gevaarlijke zone liggen vele met *kn-* beginnende woorden als *knob*, *knobble*, *knub*, *knubble*. Bij *to smack* en *to snap* geeft B. zelf de mogelijkheid van onafhankelijke onomatopoëtische vorming toe.

De opmerkingen, die ik hierboven over Bense's *Dictionary* heb gemaakt laten zich hierin samenvatten dat ik in het algemeen minder ver zou willen gaan dan de auteur in het constateren of vermoeden van ndl. invloed. Het is een eigenschap van elke recensie, dat zij bezwaren breder uitmeet dan instemming. Daarom voeg ik hieraan toe, teneinde een mogelijke verkeerde indruk bij den lezer weg te nemen, dat ik Dr. B. geenszins verdenk van iets als taal-chauvinisme. Hij heeft wel degelijk ieder geval nauwgezet overwogen, en zijn onpartijdigheid blijkt duidelijk bij sommige woorden, waar *N.E.D.* aan ontlening uit het Nederlands denkt, terwijl B. een andere mening is toegedaan, b.v. *monsoon*, *to scour*, *scraw* 'a frame upon which textile fabrics are hung to dry', *to wrack* 'to make leeway'.

Mijn bezwaren raken dan ook niet de methode en de beginselen van het werk. Zij komen voort uit verschil van inzicht, dat niets vreemds is in zaken van etymologie, waarbij subjectief aanvoelen steeds een ruime plaats inneemt, omdat klemmende argumentatie lang niet altijd te voeren is. Bovendien ben ik tot mijn algemene indruk gekomen, doordat ik het werk van kolom tot kolom doorlas. Zo doet een recensent, maar zo doet niet de normale gebruiker. Een woordenboek is er niet om in „letterlijke” zin van a tot z te worden doorgelezen: een woordenboek is een naslagwerk, en wie Bense's *Dictionary* als zodanig gebruikt, zal de volledigheid van de verzameling en de uitvoerige documentatie bij elk artikel op prijs stellen. En ook waar de lezer niet met een conclusie kan instemmen, zal hij waardering hebben voor de werkwijze van den auteur, die hem in staat stelt alle gegevens gemakkelijk te overzien en zodoende een eigen oordeel te vormen.

A Petite Pallace of Pettie his Pleasure. Edited by H. W. HARTMAN. xxxiv + 327 pp. London, New York, Toronto: Oxford University Press. 1938. \$6,50; 25s.

George Pettie, the writer of the twelve stories published under the above title in 1576, is one of those minor authors who figure more or less prominently in monographs and large-scale histories of literature, but just fall outside the range of the average handbook. In the CHEL Pettie has about half a page to himself altogether, while Baker, in the second volume of his *History of the English Novel*, allows him three pages, and René Pruvost's recent book on Greene¹ has more than two dozen references of varying length. Among the handbooks, Praz mentions Pettie as a precursor of Lyly on page 53 of his *Storia della Letteratura Inglese*, but Saintsbury, Legouis and Schirmer agree in ignoring him.

There is no reason to suppose that this allotment of space does less than justice to Pettie's artistic merits. The interest of his stories, with their skimpy treatment of the narrative proper, their epistles, harangues and moral disquisitions, is now purely 'historical' — even Professor Hartman's well got up edition is hardly likely to produce any literary rehabilitation. Having said this, one may point out, nevertheless, that a purely 'historical' interest is an entirely legitimate one, and that as a document for the history of taste and style in the 1570's Pettie's work has an undeniable importance. As Mr. Hartman observes, "the book is a valuable index to certain once fashionable mid-Elizabethan tastes, and its blend of ingenuous matter with a rococo manner has for the modern reader a quaintness all its own" — though one may doubt the aptness of the epithet 'ingenuous' to these specimens of love casuistry, and deplore the loose employment of the term 'rococo' (as of 'baroque' on the next page of the introduction).

Pettie's position as a forerunner of Euphuism has long been established (among others, by Feuillerat in his standard work on John Lyly), though a close comparison between the style of the *Petite Palace* and that of *Euphues* might still yield interesting results. Mr. Hartman points out that Pettie makes very little use of the 'unnatural natural history' so dear to Lyly; he might have added that, on the other hand, Pettie's employment of rhyme ("to utter their annoy ... to expresse our joy") far exceeds Lyly's. The former, as Mr. Hartman rightly observes, is an ornament rather than a strictly stylistic feature; the latter is of the very essence of the 'schematic' style known as Euphuism.² Further scrutiny would probably reveal similar differences in frequency, and help to clear our notions of the development of Elizabethan prose generally.

Professor Hartman has given a non-modernized reprint of the first edition, collated with the five subsequent ones, the last of which appeared in 1613. The purely linguistic aspect of his text has apparently been the least of his

¹ To be reviewed shortly.

² See my article on "Brutus's Forum Speech in Julius Caesar" in the *Review of English Studies*, January 1940.

concernments. Thus, while, as far as possible, every proverb is traced to its source, there are hardly any notes on the meaning of obsolete words (as, for example, in Croll and Clemons's edition of *Euphues*). What is worse, a number of superfluous emendations and [sic]'s suggest that the editor is on somewhat distant terms with sixteenth-century English, an impression which might easily have been avoided if he had taken the trouble to consult the Oxford English Dictionary. Such a precaution would probably have restrained him from adding an unnecessary [s] in about two dozen cases where *other* occurs in the original text with plural function (e.g.: "that shee may bee taken in the net which shee layeth to intangle other[s]").³ Similarly, possessive *it* requires the addition of *s* in modernized texts only; "of it own accord" is perfectly correct sixteenth-century English (see p. 69, l. 8; p. 144, l. 27; p. 166, ll. 17, 19 & 21; p. 246, l. 17). On p. 102, l. 12, Mr. Hartman alters *met* into *meet* in the sentence: "it is Gods word and will that such measure as is met shall be measured againe", where *met* is the obsolete past participle of the verb *to mete* = *to measure*, not the adjective *meet* = *suitable* (see Matthew 7:2 and Mark 4:24). Equally compromising [sic]'s are added to *connot* = *cannot* on p. 57, l. 11 and p. 210, l. 27; to *th'one* on p. 77, l. 24 (but not to *thone* on p. 101, l. 23!); to *refell* = *refute* on p. 119, l. 17 (but *refelled* 18/27 is left alone); to *whistered* = *whispered* on p. 129, ll. 16-17; to *nelected* = *neglected* on p. 151, l. 10; to *at randon*, 164/30; to *injury* (verb), 222/4; and to *conveiances* (?), 259/29-30. On the other hand, one looks in vain for a [sic] or an emendation (or explanation) at *Nector* (for *nectar*), 16/20; *decoram* (for *decorum*), 18/28; *with* (for *which*), 20/31; *dugling* (?), 54/17-18; *gentlewoman* (for *gentlewomen*), 55/13 & 83/24; *preceivinge* (for *perceivinge*), 75/16; *bestrow* (for *bestow*), 79/14; *her selfe* (for *him selfe*), 81/29; *mu* (for *my*), 96/26; *godwill* (*goodwill*), 117/23; *modesty* (*modestly*), 158/21; *commanudement*, 315/8-9; *his bridly bed*, 219/6; *troyall* (*trial*), 233/14; *to but* (*to buy*), 237/5; *adopt* (*adapt*), 249/18. Some of these errors may, of course, be due to the modern rather than to the sixteenth-century compositor.

There are one or two things in the Introduction and in the Notes to which one might take exception, such as an unfortunate tendency to stylistic sophistication (of a different kind from Pettie's!), and a gratuitous remark about "the medium of the Authorized Version". But it is time to stop picking holes, and to acknowledge that Professor Hartman has produced a useful, if not quite perfect edition, which anyone interested in the history of Elizabethan prose will be glad to possess.

Groningen.

R. W. ZANDVOORT.

³ Two instances of plural *other* seem to have escaped the emendator's attention, viz. on p. 49, l. 22 and on p. 64, l. 2.

The Art and Life of William Shakespeare. By HAZELTON SPENCER. xx + 495 pp. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co. 1940. Price?

We possess such a multitude of books on Shakespeare that when a new one is added to the number, the question naturally arises what justification there may be for this bold act. It has even been suggested that it would be better to stop writing about Shakespeare altogether, at least temporarily. For such defeatism, however, there is really no reason. No doubt many supererogatory books have of late been published, but quite as many that have proved valuable in various respects. There is indeed still room enough for workers in this very extensive field. A new book may be welcome, because it adds something, however little, to our knowledge, if not of Shakespeare himself, then of his relations, his contemporaries, the time and circumstances in which he lived. Or it may give a new interpretation of certain plays or passages, which if we cannot wholeheartedly accept it, gives us at least food for thought. Or again it may reveal a strikingly personal view, the reactions of a remarkable mind to the great work; a new æsthetic outlook, a theory of verse-technique etc.

The book under consideration is not redeemed by any of these features, nor does the author claim it is. It belongs to a different category. Mr. Spencer has "the inquisitive layman in mind," and as he found that "journalistic criticism betrays a certain lack, not of intelligence, nor of taste, but of information", it is chiefly the giving of information that he has had in view. There is, he says, a manifest eagerness among readers and spectators to know what scholars now think of this or that point. This demand he seeks to supply. To a large extent his book is a popularized account of the present state of Shakespeare studies. I may add at once that it is popularization in the best sense of the word. The information is quite trustworthy and up-to-date, and nothing of any importance has been overlooked. The layman must have the makings of a scholar in him, if after he has read this book, his thirst for knowledge is still unquenched. He is indeed more likely to complain that the author tries to make him swallow too much, and secretly to skip several passages; those dealing with the title-pages of first and second Quartos, for example, or with the textual history of minor plays, or the supposed dates of performances. As a matter of fact the author seems to have rather too high an opinion of the capacity, not only of the layman, but of the serious student, seeing that he calls the very valuable bibliography given at the end of the book, which covers no fewer than fifty-five closely printed pages, "the merest handful"! Again, in the preface, he expresses the hope that his book may, besides to the layman, also prove serviceable to "less experienced students". I am inclined to think that even advanced, very experienced students will find it highly useful, but then I do not know much about the level of scholarship among American students.

The author has also "tried to grapple with the æsthetic," as he says in

his preface, but he does not bestow much attention on the more purely artistic aspect of the works, and what he says about it often falls somewhat flat and gives little if any evidence of the author's own personal views. The book does not appreciably deepen our insight into the greatness of Shakespeare as an artist, a poet and word-painter. On the other hand it contains some sound criticism of the dramas considered as stage-plays, and a very full and interesting account of notable performances, illustrated by portraits of famous actors: Quin as Falstaff, Ellen Terry as Portia, Garrick as King Lear etc. The illustrations form indeed a special and valuable feature of the book. They are beautifully reproduced and well-chosen. Only I think it a pity that the modern fashion of marginless reproduction has been followed; but that is merely a matter of personal taste.

Besides the very extensive bibliography already alluded to, the numerous Notes, some of which are highly interesting, and a very full Index, enhance the value of this book, which as a useful, scholarly compendium, unusually rich in information, certainly justifies its existence.

Amsterdam.

A. G. VAN KRANENDONK.

Shakespeare's Sonnets. Edited with Introduction and Notes by TUCKER BROOKE. x + 346 pp. 8°. London & New York: Oxford University Press. 1936. Price 21 s.

Shakespeare's sonnets are the most recent compound in the wide field of Shakespearean research, not arousing the interest of scholars till well into the second half of the eighteenth century and not arriving at the attention they deserve till well into the nineteenth. With the rise of the biographical treatment of literary history their potential importance quickly became apparent and one of the first to exploit this obvious mine of information about the private life of the dramatist was the German poet and pseudo-scholar Tieck. But his story "Dichterleben", the second part of which introduces the now so famous Dark Lady, is largely based on the Southampton theory first promulgated by Nathan Drake in his book on Shakespeare in 1817. Since then, the discussion has grown in extent and intensity, till now the sonnets and their problems belong to the major battle-grounds of English literary scholarship, like the rest of the field a faithful mirror of the changing tastes and taboos of the successive generations that engaged in the strife. For the greater part of the time the biographical point of view kept the upper hand; it was only a question whether some of the sonnets were morally or artistically good enough to have been written by Shakespeare. But toward the end of the century Sidney Lee's researches showed the excessive conventionality and

artificiality of the whole sonneteering vogue, a weakness of which Shakespeare's sonnets were not entirely free, and at the turn of the century the biographical method was so low 'pon Change that in 1902 T. R. Price in his article on the Technique of Shakespeare's Sonnets declared with unmannerly exultation that it was dead. Today it is so much alive that it has to all appearances found the final, or almost final, solution of the whole problem and can even bend with condescension to making extensive use of Price's own results.

The time when a critic could seriously suggest throwing any of the sonnets out as "un-Shakespearean" seems to be over. Thorpe's collection is accepted in its entirety, and it is only a question of making sense out of what he offers, i.e., finding a situation or series of situations that will plausibly explain the sonnets and their obvious interrelationship. The only liberty permitted, a liberty that soon became a necessity, was the re-arrangement of the sonnets. Such attempts at ordering the sonnets in a sequence that will tell their story more coherently have been put forth from time to time, but only Rudolph Fischer's has received serious attention. Fischer's book was published posthumously in 1925. He recognizes certain parallels in outline between the story told in the first 126 sonnets, the Southampton story, and that told in the last 28 sonnets, the Dark Lady story, balances the two by taking a number of sonnets the sex of whose addressee is not stated from the first group and placing them in the second group and then, after pruning off the first 17 and the last two sonnets as being foreign to the main theme, he neatly dovetails the two groups into one another so as to produce a complete and plausible story of love and friendship and betrayal and reconciliation and resignation. The method is dazzling and the result startling; the reaction, perhaps best expressed in the papers published by J. A. Fort in the *RES* (1926 ff.), was a return to Thorpe and his muddled inconsistency. And now, from this retreat to scratch, Mr. Tucker Brooke has again brought the problem forward and offers what certainly is the most satisfactory solution thus far attempted and promises to be the definite one.

Tucker Brooke's method may be said to lie somewhere between those of Fischer and Fort. He re-arranges the sonnets, but not nearly with the violence of Fischer, and his final result stands close to that of Fort, but with a much greater degree of clarity and conclusiveness. He bases his arrangement on an observation that has long been current among critics of the sonnets, namely that they can be grouped in twos, threes, fours and even fives according to their wording and their content. In the first series of 126 sonnets he finds 38 such groups, leaving 13 isolated poems "not closely linked with their neighbors". In the main, these groups follow one another with tolerable consistency, but some changes — hardly half a dozen! — are necessary to clarify the sequences, while some of the isolated poems have to be redistributed. The second series of 26 poems — the last two of the whole collection are conventional exercises and do not belong to the main body — is not so easily dealt with and the

editor candidly admits that he ordered the arrangement according to his own subjective notions of "sheer poetic necessity". The story that results is far from being the highly dramatic novel Fischer reconstructed, but it has the great merit of a convincing appearance of normal reality. The poet writing the praises of his wealthy patron, the actor absent on tour or preoccupied with his professional work, the young man sowing his wild oats and gently admonished by the older man, the rather precarious friendship between the two extremes of the then social scale, the anxiety of the poet at the approach of a literary rival — the economic aspect of the situation is not always plain to present-day readers — and the famous "cutting in" of the young nobleman on the poet's love affair: all this is less a coherent "story" than the reflection of a more or less normal life with its ups and downs but without any preconceived climax. The drama comes in in the Second Series, where we see the poet wooing his mistress (though not long, if at all!), enjoying the fullness of her love, then complaining bitterly of the unfaithfulness of both mistress and friend and finally renouncing her and giving himself up in resignation to a biting analysis of his experience.

In the dating of the sonnets critics have always favoured Shakespeare's early years for the majority of the poems, but some of them have frequently been placed as late as the Hamlet period and beyond. A new impulse to the dating problem was given by G. B. Harrison's placing No. 107 in the year 1596, when Queen Elizabeth's "climacteric" or 63rd year was safely completed. Sonnet 104 speaks of a three years' friendship, which would place the beginning of this friendship in the spring of 1593, when Shakespeare dedicated his first published poem to the Earl of Southampton. This conclusion, drawn and substantiated by Fort with the help of Hermann Isaac's method of verbal parallels with the early plays, is accepted by T. B. and further buttressed by proving that several of the early plays not only contain sonnets as part of the action, but whole passages in the dialogue which are complete or partial sonnets in disguise. Sonneteering seems to have been an all but uncontrollable habit in Shakespeare's early years in London! Working on the average monthly output that can be computed from the dates, the rest of the sonnets to No. 126 would probably cover not more than one and a half years, placing the final date — since the Second Series is contemporary with a part of the first series — somewhere in the year 1597. Within these four years the poet's absences can be fairly accurately accounted for by the known tours of his company, while the private relations of Southampton also fit into the scheme with tolerably convincing force.

On T. B.'s very careful but sure handling of his argument there is very little criticism to make. I do not see the "contrast" in theme between sonnet 20 and 21 which is the basis of their being grouped together; No. 20 describes the feminine quality of the Friend's beauty without reference to anybody else, merely as a fact, while in 21 the Poet takes issue with the other sonneteers of the time and gives them a lecture on truth and honesty.

The two themes have nothing to do with one another. The transition from sonnet 35 to sonnet 36 is marked, in the opinion of the editor, by more than the usual lapse of time; "a little time has probably passed" (page 36) and so a new section of Group D is indicated. But if that is really so, is it probable that Shakespeare would have "echoed" the end of 35 in beginning 36? Would not that involve the assumption that he referred back to the previous sonnet when commencing the new one, whereas the fundamental principle of the grouping is that each was written off while a certain train of thought was alive in the poet's mind? The lapse of time had better not be emphasised here and the sub-section is hardly necessary.

This detail touches the whole problem of the transmission of the sonnets, the circumstances under which they were written and preserved till they reached the hands of Thorpe and were printed in his book. Here all is necessarily conjecture, beyond the fairly convincing conclusion that the groups were written each within a comparatively small span of time. Mr. Brooke adds the ingenious guess that there was a limit of space, too, the groups being written on single sheets of paper large enough to hold three or four sonnets, each sheet being sent off as occasion offered. This sending off, however, is not more than a probability, and in a number of cases not even that. Not all of the Southampton sonnets of the First Series are messages; some are clearly soliloquies and if Sh. sent them to his friend it must have been because of their artistic qualities more than their content. In no case is it probable that the sonnets, even when sent, were "letters"; if the friendship was as intimate and fervid as the sonnets would lead us to believe, plain prose must have been the medium of intercourse. In that case the sonnets had a different function, that of artistic "confession" for his own satisfaction on the part of the poet, and that of offerings to express regard and respect toward the patron. Hence it is not necessary to assume that they were all sent, and that is specially true of the Second Series, where several sonnets, as editors and critics before T. B. have said, "could never have been sent to a lady". This argument, to be sure, does not hold; in the lurid world of unfettered passion in which Shakespeare ostensibly lived with his Dark Lady, the lady was not expected to be ladylike and even a slight knowledge of the intimacies of literary and artistic Bohemia will show what is possible under such circumstances. The only sin is coldness, of which Sh. obviously was not guilty, and coarseness, even when presented with less consummate art than is here the case, seems quite acceptable. But again the soliloquies, especially the two sonnets with which Mr. Brooke closes his story, must have been primarily for the poet's own satisfaction and relief, and from here it seems probable that most of the others served the same purpose. The only person who in all probability had a complete set of the poems was Shakespeare himself, and Mr. Brooke offers indications that in the printing of Thorpe's book there are signs of Shakespeare's own peculiar spelling and writing. A comparison with the results of Mr. Dover Wilson's similar researches in the Hamlet texts

corroborates, on the whole, the American scholar's finds. (Would not the spelling 108.3 now (*new*) listed as a careless setting of one word for another be better among Shakespeare's peculiarities?) How "Mr. W. H." got the sonnets, along with *A Lover's Complaint*, out of Shakespeare's hands and into those of Thorpe is still a complete blank.

Basel.

H. LÜDEKE.

Der "Hamlet" Shakespeares. Von H. H. GLUNZ. (Wissenschaft und Gegenwart Nr. 13.) 69 pp. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann. 1940. RM. 1.75.

There has been a tendency in a good deal of *Hamlet* criticism (of which Bradley's lectures may be taken as an example) to concentrate on the character of Hamlet, and to take it for granted that his delay constitutes the problem of the play. Professor Glunz begins by analysing the characters of Hamlet's opponents — Claudius, Polonius, Laertes, Rosenkrantz and Guildenstern, Osric —, who, as representatives of mere worldly rationality, form a descending scale, with the gravediggers at the bottom; and of Ophelia and Gertrude, who originally do not belong to this group, but end by being drawn within its sphere. Hamlet is then shown as the protagonist of a higher order, who refuses to be dragged down to the level of Claudius and his world, because he is conscious of his vocation to destroy them and to establish a purified Denmark in their stead. To accomplish this task, Hamlet must undergo a process of inner transformation, so as to become the willing instrument of the transcendental powers of destiny, and it is this process, rather than inaction or hesitation, that accounts for the interval elapsing between the Ghost's injunction and its eventual performance. Hamlet's madness is merely apparent; it is the inability of Claudius and his fellows to understand the language of one who belongs to another world than theirs that makes them doubt his sanity.

It would be hard to say, in view of the enormous amount of what has been written on *Hamlet*, whether Professor Glunz's reading of its riddle is entirely original; it has, at any rate, the merit of striking one as personal. His argument will carry conviction to various readers in varying degrees; if it helps to get their thinking on *Hamlet* out of a groove, its effect will be all to the good. The Introduction and the Notes contain valuable summaries of the views of different schools of Shakespearean interpretation.

Groningen.

R. W. ZANDVOORT.

Brief Mention

The Seafarer. An Interpretation. By O. S. ANDERSON. (K. Humanistiska Vetenskapssamfundet i Lund Årsberättelse 1937-1938, I.) 49 pp. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup. 1937.

This valuable monograph contains *a.* a summary of the views of earlier scholars on the structure and meaning of "the cryptic piece called *Seafarer*" (Sisam); *b.* the author's own view, which in the main agrees with the allegorical interpretation of Ehrismann and Schücking; *c.* a prose translation; *d.* notes on the text of the poem. Though certainty in a matter like this will probably remain unattainable, Dr. Anderson makes out a good case for his belief that the *Seafarer* is an allegory of the miseries of human life and the longing of the soul for the better life to come. He does so, on the whole, without unduly stretching the meaning of one passage or underestimating the significance of another, and with a thorough command of Old English idiom and of the various problems involved. One may only wonder whether the unity and consistency of thought looked for in a poem like this by the modern student were equally present in the mind of the Anglo-Saxon poet, or expected by his contemporaries. Apart from this, the present monograph is another indication that, as in the study of Shakespeare, so in that of Old English poetry, the days of the disintegrators are over; the *Seafarer*, in Dr. Anderson's opinion, "must be regarded as in all essentials genuine and the work of one hand." — R. W. Z.

Acta Linguistica. Revue Internationale de Linguistique Structurale. Publié avec le Concours d'un Conseil International par V. BRÖNDAL et L. HJELMSLEV. Vol. I, Fasc. 1 and 2. Copenhagen: Einar Munksgaard. 1939. Annual Subscription 15 Dan. Cr.

This new international journal, edited and published in Denmark, may be warmly recommended to those interested in present-day linguistic theory. The "linguistique structurale" of the sub-title is defined as "toute linguistique qui voit dans la langue une structure et qui fait de la structure la norme de toutes ses classifications." Phonology, in the modern sense of the word, plays an important part in most of the articles that have hitherto appeared. There are a number of reviews and obituary notices, among them an excellent one by R. Jakobson of the late Prince Trubetzkoy. An article by Otto Jespersen on the history of the English verbal suffix *-en* seems a little out of place, except as a token of mutual esteem between writer and editors. The languages employed are French, German and English. — Z.

Over het woord Sabel. Door R. VAN DER MEULEN. (Med. der Kon. Ned. Akad. van Wetensch., Afd. Lett., N.R. Deel 3, No. 5.) 44 pp. Amsterdam: N.V. Noord-Holl. U.M. 1940. f 0.80.

In this erudite essay Dr. van der Meulen traces the etymology of the international word *sabel* (*sabre* etc.) through Russian back to a Turko-Tatar stem represented by the Khirgiz word *sapy*. He thus confirms the supposition of the OED that 'the ultimate source is prob. to be sought in some Oriental language', while controverting its opinion that the Russian word may be from German. The E. form *shable* or *shabble*, which Jamieson, acc. to the OED, defined as 'now generally used to denote an old rusty sword', is tentatively supposed to have undergone this pejorative sense-development through

association with *shabby*. This seems unnecessary; one would prefer to anticipate the author's own dismissal of a similar guess on p. 27: „Of is dit niet het geval en behoeft men er eigenlijk niets bijzonders achter te zoeken?" One may note, too, that *shabby* does not occur in Jamieson's (Scottish) dictionary. — Z.

The Plays of Christopher Marlowe. 467 pp. Oxford University Press. 1939. Price 2s.

This is a handy reprint of Marlowe's plays in The World's Classics series, with modernised orthography and footnotes to explain difficult words and translate Marlowe's Latin quotations. Presumably it is intended mainly for the use of play-reading groups. Otherwise it would have been better if the anonymous editor had reprinted the significant poems of Marlowe, even if this had involved the exclusion or compression of *The Massacre at Paris* and *Dido, Queen of Carthage*. — J. M. N.

The Sonnets of Shakespeare. A Psycho-Sexual Analysis. By H. McCLURE YOUNG. 121 pp. Published by the Author at Columbia, Mo. 1937. \$2.00.

Mr. Young attempts to prove that the author of the Sonnets was not a homosexual and I, for one, believe him. — H. L.

John Henry. A Folk-Lore Study. By L. W. CHAPPELL. vi + 144 pp. 8°. Jena: Frommannsche Buchhandlung. 1933.

John Henry is the subject of a song or group of songs sung by working men all over the American continent and all over the world where American working men and sailors roam. The author prints in an appendix 50 variations of the song, including 15 texts of a song on John Hardy more or less akin to it. The central theme of these songs is the legend of John Henry, the mighty hammer-swinging and steel-driver who beat a steam-driver in a driving contest and died as a result of his exertion. Symbolically he is the natural man who "flings himself, in a moment of triumph, against the machine of the industrial period after the Civil War". The author has in many years of painstaking labour collected a vast amount of material illustrating the spread and the development of this legend through the Southern States and has succeeded in localizing it in the Big Bend Tunnel of the Chesapeake and Ohio Railroad near Hilton, W. Va. The tunnel was cut in the early seventies of the last century and there are people still alive who worked at the cut and who remember a Negro steel-driver by that name. Working his way through a dense cloud of conflicting evidence Mr. Chappell comes to the conclusion that such a man actually existed, though he cannot be ascertained with absolute proof at this late date, and that his fate as told in the legend tallies with the known conditions under which a man of such type had to work at that time. The song in its many variations has very little to do with the legend and certainly did not arise out of it, perhaps even existed before the legend arose. It is a typical working song, born of the peculiar conditions of tunneling work, waxing and waning and always changing as it wanders from place to place and singer to singer and even from day to day and with a certain amount of erotic symbolism at least in those versions that do not smack too much of the "parlor". The 22 versions preserved on gramophone records are, of course, "pure" — but in this sense alone. — H. L.

Bibliography

Neophilologus. XXIV, 1. Oct. 1938. A. E. H. Swaen, Engelsche zangwijzen bij Hollandsche dichters, III (54-62). — C. E. Bazell, Four West Germanic verbal endings (62-66). — *Id.* XXIV, 2. Jan. 1939. L. Verkoren, Over Shelley en Hölderlin (121-126). — *Id.* XXIV, 3. April 1939. W. Matthews, South Western Dialect in the Early Modern Period (193-209). — *Id.* XXIV, 4. July 1939. J. W. Cole, Romeo and Rosaline (285-289). — *Id.* XXV, 1. Oct. 1939. F. T. Wood, The comic elements in the English mystery plays, I (39-48). — G. W. Wolthuis, The rector in Marlowe's Doctor Faustus (49-50). — J. W. Draper, The jealousy of Iago (50-60). — *Id.* XXV, 2. Jan. 1940. A. A. Prins, Some remarks on Ælfric's Lives of Saints and his translations from the Old Testament (112-122). — *Id.* XXV, 3. April 1940. F. T. Wood, The comic elements in the English mystery plays, II (194-206).

The Review of English Studies. XIV, 53. Jan. 1938. R. Willard, The two accounts of the Assumption in Blickling Homily XIII. — L. Kirschbaum, A census of bad Quartos. — C. Bowie Millican, Ralph Knevett, author of the *Supplement* to Spenser's *Faerie Queene*. — A. Jackson, The stage and the authorities, 1700-1714 (as revealed in the newspapers). — *Id.* XIV, 54. April 1938. C. F. Bühler, Some new Paston documents. — M. C. Nahm, John Wilson and his "Some few plays". — W. V. Reynolds, Goldsmith's critical outlook. — *Id.* XIV, 55. July 1938. C. T. Prouty, George Gascoigne and Elizabeth Bacon Bretton Boyes Gascoigne. — H. R. Hoppe, The First Quarto version of *Romeo and Juliet*, II. vi. and IV. v. 43 ff. — F. E. Budd, A translation attributed to Evelyn: *The Manner of Ordering Fruit-Trees* (1660). — D. Wexler, Four letters from George Crabbe to Edmund Burke. — *Id.* XIV, 56. Oct. 1938. J. Murray, *Tancred and Gismund*. — J. Blomfield, The style and structure of *Beowulf*. — J. C. Adams, The staging of *The Tempest*, III. iii. — G. B. Sherrer, Francis Mercury Van Helmont: a neglected 17th-century contribution to the science of language. — A. L. Strout, "Christopher North" on Tennyson. — M. C. Hill, A note on the Sheffield edition of Gibbon's Autobiography. — *Id.* XV, 57. Jan. 1939. E. Colledge, *The Recluse*. A Lollard interpolated version of the *Ancren Riwele*. — J. W. Draper, Shakespeare's "Star-crossed lovers". — P. L. Carver, Collins and Alexander Carlyle. — D. Coldicutt, Was Coleridge the author of the "Enquirer" series in the *Monthly Magazine*, 1796-9? — *Id.* XV, 58. April 1939. E. Colledge, *The Recluse*. A Lollard interpolated version of the *Ancren Riwele* (concluded). — G. Wilson Knight, Lyly. — W. Ringler, The source of Lodge's *Reply to Gosson*. — K. Tillotson, Drayton and Richard II: 1597-1600. — E. E. Williams, Dr. James Drake and Restoration theory of comedy. — *Id.* XV, 59. July 1939. R. M. Smith, Why a First Folio Shakespeare remained in England. — J. W. Walter, *Astrophel and Stella* and *The Romaunt of the Rose*. — E. Simpson, Jonson and Donne. — M. Fisher, Notes on the sources of some incidents in Middleton's London plays. — J. H. Wilson, Rochester, Dryden, and the Rose-Street affair. — C. B. Bradford, Johnson's revision of *The Rambler*. — *Id.* XV, 60. Oct. 1939. E. L. McAdam, Jr., Dr. Johnson's law lectures for Chambers: an addition to the canon. — K. Povey, The banishment of Lady Austen. — W. W. Beyer, Coleridge, Wieland's *Oberon*, and *The Ancient Mariner*. — E. R. Seary, Robert Southey and Ebenezer Elliott: some new Southey letters. — G. L. Phillips, Elliott's *The Giaour*. — F. M. Salter, The banns of the Chester Plays. — *Id.* XVI, 61. Jan. 1940. F. M. Salter, The banns of the Chester Plays (continued). — K. N. Cameron, Cyril Tourneur and *The Transformed Metamorphosis*. — H. G. Wright, Defoe's writings on Sweden. — J. M. S. Tompkins, *Elinor and Marianne*: a note on Jane Austen. — L. F. Powell, "The History of St. Kilda". — A. McIntosh, Middle English "Gannokes" and some place-name problems. — R. W. Zandvoort, Brutus's Forum Speech in *Julius Cæsar*. — *Id.* XVI, 62. April 1940. C. J. Sisson, The Mouse-Trap again. — F. M. Salter, The banns of the Chester plays (concluded). — R. W. Short, Ben Jonson in Drayton's poems. — E. L. McAdam,

J. r., Dr. Johnson's law lectures for Chambers, II. — E. D. Leyburn, The translations of the mottoes and quotations in the *Rambler*.

The Modern Language Review. XXXIII, 1. Jan. 1938. A. E. Parsons, The English heroic play. — *Id.* XXXIII, 2. April 1938. M. Galway, Chaucer's sovereign lady. — F. L. Wickelgren, Matthew Arnold's literary relations with France. — D. M. Mennie, Sir Walter Scott's unpublished translations of German plays. — E. N. Gummer, Dickens and Germany. — *Id.* XXXIII, 3. July 1938. H. L. Gardner, Lawful espials. — M. A. Beese, John Donne the Younger: addenda and corrections to his biography. — *Id.* XXXIII, 4. 1938. A. J. Mill, The Hull Noah play. — D. E. Baughan, Sir Philip Sidney and the matchmakers. — N. H. Hodgson, The murder of Nicholas Turberville. Two Elizabethan ballads. — J. Mark, The uses of the term 'baroque'. — *Id.* XXXIV, 1. Jan. 1939. M. P. Hamilton, Echoes of Childermas in the tale of the Prioress. — J. H. Walter, 'Wit in a Constable': censorship and revision. — *Id.* XXXIV, 2. April 1939. H. Jenkins, Peele's 'Old Wive's Tale'. — K. Tillotson, Michael Drayton as a 'Historian' in the 'Legend of Cromwell'. — R. K. Gordon, Dryden and the 'Waverley Novels'. — *Id.* XXXIV, 3. July 1939. S. R. Watson, 'Gordobuc' and the theory of tyrannicide. — P. Simpson, Ben Jonson and the Devil Tavern. — H. Brown, The influence of Byron on Emily Brontë. — N. H. Mackenzie reviews Braaksma, *Travel and Literature*. — *Id.* XXXIV, 4. Oct. 1939. M. Galway, Chaucer's Shipman in real life. — W. S. Mackie, Notes upon the text and the interpretation of 'Beowulf'. — H. J. W. Milley, Wilkie Collins and 'A Tale of Two Cities'. — W. M. Parker, The origin of Scott's 'Nigel'. — *Id.* XXXV, 1. Jan. 1940. M. Walters, The literary background of Francis Bacon's essay 'Of Death'. — W. W. Greg, The Mouse-trap—a postscript. — R. H. Perkinson, 'Volpone' and the reputation of Venetian justice. — S. Potter reviews Christopherson, *The Articles*. — G. Kitchen reviews Häusermann, *Studien zur englischen Literaturkritik, 1910-30*. — *Id.* XXXV, 2. April 1940. T. Sen, Hamlet's treatment of Ophelia in the nunnery scene. — A. Barker, Christian liberty in Milton's divorce pamphlets. — A. L. Strout, Wordsworth's desiccation.

Medium Ævum. VII. 1. Febr. 1938. D. Everett, The relationship of Chetre's *Launfal* and *Lybeaus Desconus*. — C. E. Wright, Two Ælfric fragments. — *Id.* VII. 2. June 1938. C. W. Jones, The Byrhtferth glosses. — F. M. Dear, Chaucer's *Book of the Lion*. — C. T. Onions, The phrase *end of one's kin*. — *Id.* VII. 3. Oct. 1938. C. F. Bühler, A Lollard tract: On translating the Bible into English. — *Id.* VIII, 1. Feb. 1939. N. R. Ker, The Hague manuscript of the Epistola de Obitu Bedae with Bede's Song. — E. Colledge, The English prose *Benedictus*: a second manuscript. — *Id.* VIII, 2. June 1939. A. G. Mitchell, The text of *Piers Plowman* C. Prologue l. 215. — *Id.* VIII, 3. Oct. 1939. D. Whitelock, *Beowulf* 2444-2471. — S. O. Andrew, Three textual cruxes in *Beowulf*. — *Id.* IX, 1. Feb. 1940. N. R. Ker, Unpublished parts of the *Ormulum* printed from MS. Lambeth 783.

Leeds Studies in English and Kindred Languages. Number Six. 1937. B. Dickins, The day of Byrhtnoth's death and other obits from a twelfth-century Ely Kalendar. — B. Dickins, The day of the battle of Æthelingadene. — N. R. Ker, The date of the 'tremulous' Worcester hand *with plate*. — R. M. Wilson, More lost literature II. — E. S. Olszewska, Norse alliterative tradition in Middle English I. — E. S. Olszewska, ME *isked* 'longed'. — B. Dickins and R. M. Wilson, *Sent kasi*. — B. Dickins, Textual notes on a newly-discovered Flodden Poem.

Études Anglaises. II, 1. Jan.-Mars 1938. J. J. Mayoux, Rowlandson. — E. K. Brown, Edith Wharton. — J. Farenç, "Murder in the Cathedral" à la scène. — G. Lafourcade, Le centenaire de Swinburne. — *Id.* II, 2. Avril-Juin 1938. J. Bailhache, Le sentimentalisme de Barrie. — J. Loiseau, La croisade de Sinclair Lewis. — M.-L. Muffang, La poésie contemporaine de la Nouvelle-Zélande. — F. Delattre, J.-H. Newman, éducateur. — P. Legouis, A Journal from Parnassus. — *Id.* II, 3. Juillet-Sept. 1938. [Hommage à Emile Legouis]. L. Cazamian, La personnalité

d'Emile Legouis. — R. Huchon, Emile Legouis et le Moyen Âge. — F. Delattre, Emile Legouis et la Renaissance anglaise. — E. de Sélincourt, Emile Legouis and Wordsworth. — Longworth-Chambrun, Emile Legouis vu par une de ses élèves. — C. Chemin, Emile Legouis à Lyon. — Liste des publications d'Emile Legouis. — **Id.** II, 4. Oct.-Déc. 1938. R. Lalou, Les fins et les moyens d'Aldous Huxley. — L. Malarmey, Lord Grey of Fallodon. — A. Koszul, A propos de quelques éditions récentes de Caxton. — **Id.** III, 1. Jan.-Mars 1939. F. Delattre, Auguste Angellier et le génie poétique de Robert Burns. — J. Murray, English character. — J. Vallette, En relisant les poèmes de Lascelles Abercrombie (1881-1938). — **Id.** III, 2. Avril-Juin 1939. E. Legouis, La psychologie dans le Songe d'une nuit d'été. — Cambillard, Le songe d'une nuit d'été, thème astrologique. — M.-L. Cazamian, William Butler Yeats. — R. Andraud, L'Australie dans les romans de H. H. Richardson. — **Id.** III, 3. Juillet-Sept. 1939. Ch.-M. Garnier, George Russell, poète du sommeil, avec fragments de lettres inédites. — E. M. Reynaud, T. E. Lawrence d'après sa correspondance. — L. Tillier, Sur deux chapitres de "Clayhanger". — J. Bélanger, Note sur "Roderick Random" et l'expédition de Carthagène. — E. Jacobet, K. Mansfield et Tchekhov. — **Id.** III, 4. Oct.-Déc. 1939. L. Cazamian, Le temps dans le roman anglais contemporain. — H. C. Rice, En marge de quelques traductions de Kipling. — D. F. Ash, Anglo-French relations in "King John". — J. Catel, Un inédit de Walt Whitman. — L. Eyriqnoix, La dette de Shaw envers Samuel Butler, deux documents. — C. Morgan, Charles Du Bos. — E. Blunden, Romantic Poetry. — F. Mossé reviews Engblom, *On the origin and early development of the auxiliary "do"*.

Revue de Littérature Comparée. XVIII, 2. Avril-Juin 1938. I. H. Radulescu, Les intermédiaires français de Shakespeare en Roumanie. — A. Maillet, Dryden et Voltaire. — **Id.** XVIII, 3. Juillet-Sept. 1938. F. Simone, Le Moyen Âge, la Renaissance et la critique moderne. — H. Roddier, La querelle Rousseau-Hume. — **Id.** XVIII, 4. Oct.-Déc. 1938. L. M. Ragg, Madame de Lamartine et sa famille anglaise. — R. Michaud, Baudelaire et Edgar A. Poë: une mise au point. — **Id.** XIX, 1. Jan. 1939. R. Z. Temple, Aldous Huxley et la littérature française. — **Id.** XIX, 2. Avril-Juin 1939. C. Looten, Giordano Bruno (1548-1600) à Londres. — R. A. Leigh, Le "Voyage en Angleterre" d'Amédée Pichot. — R. Etienneble, Le sonnet des voyelles. — **Id.** XIX, 3. Juillet-Sept. 1939. H. Guillemin, Lamartine, Byron et Mme Guiccioli. — S. David, Carol Kennicott de "Main Street", et sa lignée européenne. — **Id.** XIX, 4. Oct.-Déc. 1939. W. McC. Stewart, Racine vu par les Anglais de 1800 à nos jours. — F. B. Bowe, Recherches sur Racine dans l'Amérique du Nord. — **Id.** XX, 1. Jan.-Mars 1940. M.-H. Pauly, W. B. Yeats et les symbolistes français. — C. E. Engel, Le colonel Lawrence et la culture française.

A Reading of the Play-Scene in Hamlet

I

Several notable attempts have been made in recent years to solve the problems raised by the play-scene in *Hamlet*. The main problem turns on whether or not Claudius saw the dumb-show, and, if he did, why he did not betray his guilt there and then, instead of doing so (apparently) while *The Murder of Gonzago* was playing. There is a subsidiary problem regarding the identification of the lines which Hamlet interpolated in the play.

The explanations offered seem to me to suffer from 'Hamlet-complex'. The 'Hamlet-complex' may be defined as a tendency to accept Hamlet, more or less unconsciously, not merely as the central and unifying figure of the play, as, of course, he is, but also as the only character who ever rises above mediocrity in thought or action. The saw about *Hamlet* without the Prince of Denmark presents the complex in a popular form. Why not *Othello* without the Moor of Venice or *The Tempest* without Prospero? A second objection to the theories advanced is that they owe too much to scholarly sophistication. Dr. W. W. Greg, who first propounded revolutionary theories about the Mouse-Trap business, took as one of the mottoes for his *Alcazar and Orlando* Whitehead's, "Seek simplicity and distrust it," and as another the, doubtless, authoritative assurance of *Chu Chin Chow* that "Work can only be done one way". These dicta hold good for bibliographical (i.e. scientific) work, and Dr. Greg is a bibliographical genius. Whether they are a safe guide to textual interpretation is another matter.

In a recent article¹ Greg goes back somewhat on his original suggestion that "the play did *not* reproduce the circumstances of his (Claudius') crime (his subsequent behaviour being due to other causes) and the Ghost's revelation was therefore not true," and now decides that the evidence is not necessarily inconsistent with the truth of what the Ghost has said. His contention that it is Hamlet's outrageous behaviour and not the King's guilty conscience which leads to the break-up seems to me a substitute explanation based on the later information supplied by Guildenstern:

The king, sir, Is in his retirement marvellous distempered
with choler.

and the Queen :

Hamlet, thou hast thy father much offended.

¹ W. W. Greg, *The Mouse-Trap — A Postscript*. Modern Language Review, Jan. 1940. XXXV, pp. 8-10.

Here the dramatic propriety of the prayer-scene is left out of account. It is surely inconsistent that Claudius should reveal his guilt, and his tortured thoughts, in this soliloquy (3. 3. 36-72), and that he should resort to prayer and seek forgiveness at a time when the plan to murder Hamlet must be already in his mind. Indeed, the prayer-scene might have been introduced more pertinently at an earlier point in the play, *unless* Shakespeare wished to shew that the Mouse-Trap had, in fact, caught "the conscience of the king." Why on earth should Claudius be moved to prayer and repentance just at the moment when he is mortally offended by Hamlet's misconduct?

Professor Dover Wilson's main contention² is that Claudius did not see the dumb-show, but was engaged in conversation. He maintains, and Greg agrees, that the dumb-show was introduced by the players to the surprise and discomfiture of Hamlet. This is ingenious, but there is no real textual justification for such conjectures. They are valid merely as devices for present-day performances of the play. The same is substantially true of Dr. Lawrence's theory³ which assumes that Claudius gave himself away during the dumb-show and during the play. In the most recent solution of the problem, Professor Sisson⁴ discerns a two-fold function in the scene; a piece of detective work on Hamlet's part, and a 'flash-back' to tell the audience the whole story of the murder of King Hamlet on Shakespeare's part. Like Wilson, he decides that Claudius did not see the dumb-show, but for a very different reason; namely that the Dumb-Show was for the benefit of the audience, and that they must see it while Claudius must not. Thus, the Dumb-Show was performed on the inner stage and the characters grouped on the main stage in such a way that the action on the inner stage was invisible to Claudius. Sisson ignores one point that lends colour to his theory, the fact that Hamlet refused to sit by Gertrude and chose to be by Ophelia. His interpretation seems plausible in the light of Elizabethan stage technique, and it possibly explains the method by which the Ghost was made invisible to Gertrude in Act 3 Scene 4. Nevertheless, its validity is only scenic, and it suggests an artificiality in the scene which does not exist. Hamlet condemns "inexplicable dumb-shows" as most of the commentators have been quick enough to point out, but he also speaks of playing,

whose end both at the first, and now, was and is, to hold as 'twere the mirror up to nature.

Sisson's theory suggests an unhappy departure from this principle. When he says, "It is clear that the Dumb-Show was seen by the audience and also by Hamlet and Ophelia, who comment upon it, and no one else to our knowledge," he is using a check that might be dangerous if applied

² J. Dover Wilson, *What Happens in Hamlet* and *Hamlet*, New Shakespeare Edition.

³ W. W. Lawrence, *Hamlet and the Mouse-Trap*. PMLA. Sept. 1939. LIV.

⁴ C. J. Sisson. *The Mouse-Trap Again*. Review of English Studies. April 1940. XVI.

to other plays of Shakespeare or his contemporaries. But that is beside the point. The clear and reasonable objection is that no audience could possibly be expected to guess that the King does not see the Dumb-Show. They will naturally assume that Claudius sees what they see, and if Sisson is right the wonder is that Claudius does not take immediate umbrage at not being permitted to see a play to which he has been invited.

Wilson's theory is superior to this simply because it is more actable. But the most straightforward explanation of this genre which occurs to me, and one which, I suppose, must have been used by producers at various times, is that based on the saying that 'there are none so blind as those who won't see.' It was not customary for the Dumb-Show in Elizabethan drama to "import the argument of the play," so that Claudius would not expect a repetition. The directions for the Dumb-Show in Quarto 2 and in the Folio are quite explicit, and I am convinced that the moment the King "lays him down upon a bank of flowers" and the Queen "seeing him asleep leaves him," Claudius would recall the similar situation of a sleeping king, and would naturally close his eyes or turn away his head whatever the subsequent action of the show. We cannot close or turn away our ears, and it is the spoken word that gets him in the end. This reaction is not an unusual one, and is employed with sure dramatic effect by Shelley in Act 1 of *Prometheus Unbound* where Panthea sees two of the tortures inflicted on the Titan,

Alas! I looked forth twice, but will no more.

Indeed, Panthea's,

Let us not tempt worse fear
By looking forth,

might well be the thoughts, if not the words, of Claudius.

This is merely a suggestion, and there are, no doubt, many objections to it. The main objection to the hypotheses that have been considered is that they are based on the invalid critical method of *creating* a solution. Literary criticism cannot create, it can only perceive, and such a problem as that presented by the play-scene in *Hamlet* can, I am convinced, be illuminated but not solved. This is, after all, not the only scene in *Hamlet* where there are anomalies and loose ends, nor is Shakespeare always careful to be consistent or explicit elsewhere, so that it is doubtful whether we have any right to look for a complete solution of all the problems raised here, or even of the central ones.

II

What follows is an attempt to illuminate certain details, and to shew that these minimise the inconsistencies so much that they cease to be of any real consequence. In the first place, it is necessary to get clean away

from the 'Hamlet-complex' by considering the qualities and character of Hamlet's opponent, Claudius. In a recent study of *King Lear*⁵ I suggested that several of the lesser characters are, potentially, the heroes of admittedly slighter tragedies. This is not equally true of *Hamlet*, and yet what is Macbeth but the tragedy of a nobler Claudius.⁶ Claudius is a man of action. He has committed a murder, and committed it cunningly. So cunningly, in fact, that he feels himself secure and unsuspected. According to Hamlet he is a sensual drunkard. This may be true, it may be just the expression of Hamlet's malice: it is, in any case, part of the regrettable Elizabethan notion of the Danes:

The Danes are bursten-bellied sots, that are to be confuted with nothing
but tankerds or quart pots. (Nashe. *Pierce Penilesse*.)

He is ambitious, perceptive, intelligent, suspicious, and capable of drastic and ruthless action. Long before the play-scene he suspects Hamlet of something, and sets his spies to watch. Spying plays an important part in *Hamlet*, but it is easy nowadays to underestimate its importance. I suggest that Shakespeare uses the same technique for the spies here as he uses in his mob scenes, that of using a handful of individuals to stand for a crowd. To an Elizabethan audience, spying meant spying on a large scale. Walsingham, for instance, spent over three thousand pounds on secret service between March 1587 and June 1588.⁷ One would not, perhaps, be far wrong in regarding Polonius as a cross between Walsingham and Robert Poley, the head and chief spy of a gang of spies.

The King's suspicions must have some basis, but it is not easy to see what conclusions he can draw from Hamlet's behaviour. Hamlet's strange conduct may be due to grief for the loss of his father. But grief is not a particularly suspicious circumstance, nor is a man of the King's disposition likely to understand, or even recognise, grief of this kind. As we see in the course of the play, Claudius is capable of self-pity only. Another possible explanation: Hamlet is in love with Ophelia. Claudius puts this to the test, and decides that it is not the true one.

Love! his affections do not that way tend,
Nor what he spake, though it lacked form a little,
Was not like madness — there's something in his soul,
O'er which his melancholy sits on brood,
And I do doubt the hatch and the disclose
Will be some danger.

⁵ *King Lear* — *The Moral Aspect*. English Studies. Dec. 1939. XXI.

⁶ This view, together with several others expressed here, is endorsed by Dr. Granville-Barker in his acute analysis of the play-scene in *Prefaces to Shakespeare: Third Series*. As Granville-Barker's book will be familiar to readers of this article I have not thought it necessary to indicate points of agreement.

⁷ vide John Bakeless, *Christopher Marlowe*, for details of Elizabethan secret service.

This speech disposes of another explanation which may have occurred to Claudius, that Hamlet is displeased because of his mother's "o'er-hasty marriage". If that were the cause of his behaviour, then there would be no reason for Claudius to fear. And yet Claudius does fear some danger. It is just before the play-scene that he first suspects this danger, and from then on it becomes an obsession with him. He is left with two possible alternatives: either Hamlet is ambitious for the crown of Denmark, or, and this is what the King's guilty conscience might have told him, he has, by some mysterious means, learned the true circumstances of his father's death and is seeking revenge. The King's suspicions are swinging unhappily between these two possibilities just when he receives the most unexpected thing of all, Hamlet's courteous invitation to the play. It is this unlooked-for piece of kindness that clinches the King's suspicions. It is unlikely that the play is a device for seizing the crown. It is, I think, fairly clear from the text that if Hamlet contemplated such action he would seek the help of the populace, and would not attempt usurpation at the court, where the majority would unquestionably side with Claudius. Thus, by a process of elimination, we see that the invitation can direct the King's suspicions one way, and one way only — to the conclusion that Hamlet knows or suspects the truth. Claudius is on his guard at once.

It is not likely that Hamlet will under-estimate the intelligence of such a man. He decides to take a long shot.

I'll have these players
Play something like the murder of my father
Before mine uncle, I'll observe his looks,
I'll tent him to the quick, if a'do blench
I know my course.

In addition, he persuades the actors to insert a number of lines of his own composition into their play, *The Murder of Gonzago*. There are two important considerations which commentators have ignored. In the first place, Claudius *has* murdered a king and a brother, *has* seized his crown, *has* married his widow with indecent haste, and at this stage of the play neither audience nor commentators (who have never committed murder anyway) are entitled to assume that Claudius will blench at the mere sight of a stage murder — especially in a conventional play with a conventional, if unfamiliar, plot. Secondly, Hamlet says, "I'll tent him to the quick," and this signifies something quite apart from the Dumb-Show and *The Murder of Gonzago*. It implies, surely, that Hamlet is not convinced that these two expedients will be sufficient to confirm the King's guilt. He realises, in short, that it will be difficult to make the desired impression on Claudius, and that he must increase and vary his provocations. Thus he plans four pieces of provocation: the Dumb-Show; the play itself; his own comments during the performance; the lines inserted in the play.

III

From this point of view, an interpretation of the minutiae of the Play Scene proper is supererogatory. There are, nevertheless, interesting points, mainly connected with Hamlet's attempts to "tent him to the quick." The situation, as I have tried to shew, is that Claudius suspects that Hamlet has some knowledge of his guilt, while Hamlet suspects that Claudius knows this and has some inkling of his plan. It would be bad psychology for Hamlet to feign complete ignorance: his proper game is to keep Claudius guessing, alternately arousing and lulling his fears. The start of the scene is like Timon's banquet. Within the scope of thirty lines Hamlet roundly insults Polonius, Gertrude and Ophelia. His answer to the King's greeting,

Excellent i'faith, of the chameleon's dish, I eat the air, promise-crammed
— you cannot feed capons so

is an insult, but it is a covert and riddling one. Its meaning possibly eludes Claudius, and it is certain that it would be unintelligible to those around him. Polonius may be ignored, for he is at all times Hamlet's laughing-stock: it is the women who are insulted and this is significant. Claudius may imagine that Hamlet's battery is to be directed against Gertrude and Ophelia. Then comes a disturbing side-attack. Hamlet tells Ophelia,

What should a man do but be merry, for look you how
cheerfully my mother looks, and my father died within's two hours.

There is great virtue in this "within's two hours". Had he said, "two hours ago", or "less than two hours since", there would be no ambiguity. But here the ambiguity exists and seems to be intentional. The remark can mean: it is less than two hours since he died (i.e. very recently); and also, he died within these coming two hours traffic of the stage (i.e. in *The Murder of Gonzago*.) Then follows the Dumb-Show. The poisoner is 'Lucianus' according to Quarto 1, 'an other man' in Quarto 2, and 'a Fellow' in the Folio. As Granville-Barker observes, "the Folio's labelling of the murderer as 'a Fellow' does, in fact, suggest no such figure as the King's"⁸. It is not in accordance with Hamlet's plan to make the resemblance too striking and we may take it that the Dumb-Show's purpose is to increase the King's perplexity rather than to secure evidence of his guilt.

This, Hamlet tells Ophelia, is 'miching mallecho'. Wilson goes rather far in assuming that the term indicates displeasure with the players for having introduced the Dumb-Show surreptitiously. Taking her cue, perhaps, from Hamlet's 'within's two hours', Ophelia shrewdly observes,

Belike this show imports the argument of the play.

⁸ Harley Granville-Barker, *op. cit.*

Claudius will listen for Hamlet's answer, but he gets no satisfaction. Alternatively we may suppose that Ophelia asks these questions because Claudius has told her to do so, and for reasons which are obvious. That this is what Hamlet himself thinks is quite feasible, for he gives no answer and consistently insults her. One speaks of 'freezing' a person.

The Murder of Gonzago proceeds, with Hamlet's two remarks touching the Queen's guilt,

That's wormwood, wormwood.

and,

If she should break it now!

Quarto 2 prints both these in the margin, which suggests, to Wilson, that "they may have been added after the *Gonzago* play had been composed." This is a questionable explanation. It may indicate, as Dowden⁹ assumed in the case of the first remark, an aside. The true explanation is, I believe, that as there are two plays, *Hamlet* and *The Murder of Gonzago*, in action at once, Quarto 2 provides a kind of parallel text. To print these words in alignment with the rest of the text would imply that Hamlet interrupted the play; to print them in the margin indicates that he did not. Consequently the remarks would probably pass unnoticed, except, perhaps, by Claudius who would see in them gibes at Gertrude's inconstancy with, again, the unascertainable suggestion of Hamlet's knowledge of the crime.

Hamlet speaks directly to the Queen,¹⁰

Madam, how like you this play?

Claudius is still unhappy,

Have you heard the argument? is there no offence in 't?

So far the play has only been offensive in its references to the second marriage. If it suggests anything at all connected with the death of King Hamlet it is that Gertrude murdered him, not Claudius,

None wed the second, but who killed the first.

Claudius asks,

What do you call the play?

and Hamlet tells him — The Mouse-trap — and Hamlet's answer may suggest that it is a trap for the women. The pun on 'marry' applies to Gertrude rather than to Claudius, since the marriage guilt, in Hamlet's eyes, lies with her rather than with Claudius. 'Mouse' occurs elsewhere in *Hamlet* as a pet name for a woman. Hamlet still keeps the King guessing,

⁹ *Hamlet* ed. Edward Dowden. Arden Shakespeare.

¹⁰ It may be noted that, according to Sisson's theory, he would have to shout these words across the court, but this is, of course, not impossible.

your majesty, and we that have free souls, it touches us not — let the galled jade wince, our withers are unwrung.

Here he touches lightly on the King's guilt and then turns straight to the jade — the female of the species again ¹¹. Claudius is still undecided, but resolves to go while the going is good. It is immediately before he breaks off the play that Hamlet proclaims his knowledge of the true nature of the crime,

you shall see anon how *the murderer* gets the love of Gonzago's wife.

There is no longer any question of Hamlet's meaning, and in this respect it is really Hamlet who breaks off the play. The King rises, and immediately Hamlet cries,

What, frightened with false fire!
(i.e. fireworks or a discharge of blank shot.)

Hamlet, in his remarks to and about the women, has been firing blank shot from the scene's opening. He later seeks Horatio's confirmation,

Didst perceive?
Hor. Very well, my lord.
Hamlet. Upon the talk of poisoning?
Hor. I did very well note him.

But it was Hamlet, not Lucianus of the play, who used the word 'poisons'. Hamlet has, in fact, carried out his plan, and his whole plan, to "tent him to the quick," and this device has succeeded, even though the Dumb-Show and the play failed to produce the desired evidence.

IV

The question of Hamlet's own lines is one that has aroused a good deal of comment, though it is of little importance in connexion with the play as it has been given us by Shakespeare. The reason why these lines have not been located in *The Murder of Gonzago* is, I am convinced, simply because they are not there. They are not likely, after all, to be spoken before the murder of the Player King, and it follows that the play is broken off before they are reached. Hamlet plans, as I have said, four provocative devices, and this is the one which, as subsequent events shew, proves unnecessary and is surrendered in the course of the action.

It is, of course, impossible to conjecture the contents of lines which do not exist, but it is possible to guess the nature of Hamlet's interpolation in the light of *The Murder of Gonzago* itself. It would dispense with the innuendo which we find in the play, and would be couched 'in good

¹¹ cf. Lyly, *Euphues*, ed. R. Warwick Bond. I. 257, and II. 151 for the probable source of Hamlet's words: Wilson's note.

set terms'. It is pure speculation to claim that it would roundly accuse Claudius of the murder, and yet I fail to see what else it could do. On the whole, it seems that Shakespeare was not very much concerned with the ultimate fate of Hamlet's own lines, and the matter may safely be left there. However, this and one or two other things connected with the Play-Scene do seem to me to supply plausible evidence of the scope and nature of the earlier *Hamlet's Revenge*¹², and I propose to conclude with an attempt to re-construct part of that play.

V

There can be no question that Shakespeare's *Hamlet* owes a debt, and a considerable debt, to *Hamlet's Revenge*, a play first produced, it is thought, in 1589. The early play is generally ascribed to Kyd on grounds which must be admitted to be credible. It is, at any rate, certain that it was written either by Kyd or by an imitator. Even if it was a very early piece by Shakespeare, as some critics believe, this still holds good, for we have the evidence of *Titus Andronicus* to shew that Shakespeare was, at the outset, capable of very good Kyd pastiche. This means that the early play made closer contact with *The Spanish Tragedy* than Shakespeare's *Hamlet* does, and we may also take it for granted that in certain particulars it was closer to Kyd's play than it was to Shakespeare's. This is fundamental: we have only to look at Shakespeare's transmutation of other early plays to see that it is a principle that admits of no exception. How far the early play must have been characteristic of Kyd it is impossible to say because the Kyd canon is tantalisingly indeterminate, but it can be said that a likeness to *The Spanish Tragedy* must have existed.

The most striking thing is, of course, the fact that an inner play is common to both Shakespeare's *Hamlet* and *The Spanish Tragedy*, and there can be little doubt that it was also to be found in *Hamlet's Revenge*. Knowing what we do of Kyd and his play, and of the general practice of the period, it is doubtful whether Hamlet ever doubted the truth of the Ghost's revelation in the early play. That may be confidently set aside as a refinement introduced by Shakespeare. It follows, then, that there the play scene served an entirely different purpose, and was not an instrument for proving the King's guilt, which is all that it is in *Hamlet*. Wilson¹³ argues that Hamlet prepares the court for the assassination of Claudius, and this seems to be precisely the purpose of the play scene in the earlier play. It may be noted that Shakespeare brings all his characters on to the stage for the play scene, and then surprisingly little happens. This kind of thing can hardly be done to order: like a musical stretto it has to come about gradually. It is curious, too, that the play-scene and its revelations do not loom very large in the subsequent action and dialogue.

¹² There may or may not be justification for using this title, but it is more justifiable than that vilely hideous term *Ur-Hamlet* which suggests a play of Chaldean origin.

¹³ *Hamlet* ed. J. Dover Wilson. New Shakespeare Edn. Note to 3. 2. 24.

Hamlet's stormy interview with his mother (3. 4.) is not, after all, the result of his "outrageous behaviour" at the play, but of the scheme laid before the King by Polonius, in 3. 1.,

My lord, do as you please,
But if you hold it fit, after the play,
Let his queen-mother all alone entreat him
To show his grief, *let her be round with him,*
And I'll be placed (so please you) in the ear
Of all their conference.

(the italics are not Shakespeare's). Kyd, in *The Spanish Tragedy*, uses the inner play of *Soliman and Perseda* as a means of bringing about the final catastrophe. In treating the Hamlet story he would probably use exactly the same technique again. An imitator certainly would. In such a scene Hamlet's own lines could have only one purpose. They would roundly accuse the King of the murder, and the play of *Hamlet's Revenge* would come to a Kydian close, with a litter of corpses on the stage, preceded, no doubt, by a duel between Hamlet and Claudius. There is absolutely no reason to imagine that Kyd's treatment would, or could, include all the subtleties and refinements that Shakespeare employs, and that his play-scene would have the same sophisticated function as Shakespeare's is unthinkable.

There are, of course, additional possibilities. In *The Murder of Gonzago* the poisoner is, according to Hamlet,

one Lucianus, nephew to the king.

That is, as Wilson shrewdly observes, the Hamlet not the Claudius of the Gonzago story. This is just one hint which makes it seem possible that the play-scene in *Hamlet's Revenge* conformed even more closely with that in *The Spanish Tragedy*: in being enacted by the main characters and not by a company of players. It is, in any case, not unlikely that Hamlet acted a part, just as Hieronimo does, and for the same purpose. If so, it may be that certain sections of 2. 2. belong, substantially, to the older play. Hamlet's recitation (2. 2. 456-68), and his detailed comments on acting, both of which shew great personal ability, need far more explaining away than the Dumb Show and the Mouse-Trap tropical, simply because there is, so it seems to me, much more of this kind of thing than Shakespeare would normally put into a scene of his own invention. I suggest, then, that the play-scene marks the scope of the earlier play, and that if we take into consideration what must, almost certainly, have been the nature and purpose of the old play-scene some of the inconsistencies in Shakespeare's version drop out altogether and the rest are completely irrelevant.

Demonstrative Pronouns

(Dutch and English Compared)

1. Like all other pronouns, demonstratives function for mark-words, that is "they put, as it were, a mark on the word they are associated with, singling it out or pointing to it in various ways". (H. Sweet, *A New English Grammar* I, 35).

The situation of the speaker versus the interlocutor(s) is as a rule sufficient to supply the meaning of pronominal junctions, as in *this man*, *that book*, *these chairs*, *those windows*. Unlike qualifying adjectives, such as *green*, *sweet*, *tall* etc., they do not tell anything about the attributes of persons or things, but just mark one of them off from others. As all pronouns have this element of reference in common, it is not surprising that there should be so much overlapping of function in the general pronominal field.

2. Demonstratives are used to refer not only to things in space, but also to things in time or in thought, hence also to sentences and parts of sentences. Between *this book* and *that book* there is a spatial difference; *from that day* to *this* marks a difference of time; *this is what I mean* refers to something in the speaker's mind; *that is what I mean*, on the other hand, generally refers back to a remark made by the person spoken to. (Observe the different intonation and accentuation of the two sentences, the former having a falling, the latter a rising tone.)

3. *This* and *these* refer to nearer, *that* and *those* to more remote ideas. Consequently *this* is commonly used to denote what concerns the speaker more intimately than what is indicated by *that*. Compare: *Fine doings these*, and *that would be a fine plan* (that plan of yours.) Cf. the parallelism in *Here is a fine mess* and *There is a good boy!*

4. *That* and *those* generally imply a contrast with *this* and *these*. Dutch *die* (sing. or plural) on the other hand is often used without any implication of contrast. E.g.: *Hij dronk, en dat kon je wel zien aan die paarsche adertjes op zijn neus* = He was given to drink, as you could tell from the purple veins on his nose. (J. Kooistra, *Teksten*, 4, 13). English prefers the definite article when no contrast is intended. Compare: The minister was fatigued with the services of *the* day. (= that day, Dutch *die* dag; *Jessica's First Prayer*.)

5. Another important thing to be observed about the demonstrative pronouns is that they may be forward-pointing or back-pointing (anaphoric). It is the back-pointing function that presents the greatest difficulties to Dutch learners. If back reference is made to one person *this* and *that* cannot be used, English mostly employing the personal pronouns, *he*, *she*, (*it* for things), according as the case may be.

The plurals *these* and *those*, however, may be used both for persons and for things in the same way as the personal pronoun *they*, *these* and *those* being more emphatic. Compare the following examples: 1. Among Lincoln's friends there were many who doubted the wisdom of freeing the slaves. One of *these* was a minister of a weak and timid character. 2. Only 15 out of the 61 women candidates nominated for Parliament were elected. Of *these* 13 are Unionists. 3. Mr. and Mrs. Amos Weber Jr., of Waterloo Ont. recently became the parents of twin sons. *These* came after seven children had been born to the parents.

6. As regards number, it must be observed that in English there is agreement between the demonstrative pronouns and the nouns to which they refer. Hence: *this* is my book, *these* are my books, *that* is your pencil, *those* are your pencils. Cf. the Du.: Dit is mijn boek, dit zijn mijn boeken.

7. Sometimes English in pointing back employs *this* where Dutch favours *dat* or *die*. After talking about some subject or other a Dutchman is apt to ask: „Hoe verklaar je *dat* verschijnsel nu?” an Englishman being more inclined to say “How do you explain *this* phenomenon?”¹. Compare also the following example: That comes from washing your neck every day. I've often told you so. I don't believe in going too far with *these* modern customs. (Shaw, *Arms and the Man*, p. 27.)

8. As the dem. prons. are closely associated with the personal pronouns of the third person, they may often stand in what is virtually a possessive relation to the words they modify and vice-versa. In this case English prefers possessives where Dutch usage has decided in favour of demonstratives: Zij had heel vriendelijk voor hem willen zijn, maar *dat* voornemen was in het water gevallen. She meant to have been very kind to him, but *her* intention had not materialized.

9. If the demonstrative happens to be in the objective relation, the corresponding object forms: *him*, *her*, *it* or *them* are used by the side of the demonstratives proper. Examples: What a number of pictures you have got! Where did you get *them*? Dutch: Waar heb je *die* gekregen? What a beautiful pussy (dog) you've got. Where did you get *her* (him)? Where did you get *that* (*those*)? is used if greater stress is intended, following from surprise or wonder.

10. If back-reference is made to the names of one or more persons restricted by a prepositional adjunct or a relative clause, English employs the collocation *the one*, plural *the ones*: ... *the one* (the gentleman) in the top hat is the mayor; Abgarus, the oldest and *the one* who loved Artaban the best; *the one* whom I seek has gone before me. (Henry van Dyke, *The Story of the Other Wise Men*).

In the case of thing-antecedents either *that* (*those*) or *the one(s)* may be employed: I was thinking about my new dress. You know, *the one* you gave me. (Clemence Dane, *Granite*.)

When the reference is to plural or singular names of things *those* or *that* can also be used, e.g.: Do you see those new houses? *The one* (or *that*) with the red tiles is the doctor's — or: the red-tiled one is the doctor's. English has no pronoun, however, if the Dutch prep. adj. marks a genitive relation: Your own umbrella is broken, better take *dad's* (*mine*): *die van vader*, *die van mij*. Nor is *the one* available for mass-words or abstract nouns. (Curme, *A Grammar of the English Language*, vol. II, 7 VII b ff.)

11. Sometimes, instead of using a pronoun, the antecedent is repeated for the sake of distinctness: I was going to ask the milkman where his son was when *the boy* (*the latter*) appeared from behind a cupboard.² — The banker made a note of the young man's name and address. The next day *the young man* received a cheque.

This form of reference to a noun may be advisable also in the case of Dutch demonstrative genitives, inflectional or periphrastic. E.g.: Person had dit verwacht. „Wat moet ik doen?” herhaalde Eric, nog angstiger. Hij sidderde bij de gedachte de beteekenis *dier* kalmte begrepen te hebben. = Person had been expecting this. “What shall I do?” repeated Eric, even more anxiously than before. He shuddered at the thought that he had understood *Person's* composure.

12. Back-reference may be indefinite: “Miss Douglas, I want a truthful answer, and I hope you'll give me *one*.” (Mrs. Walton, *The Lost Clue*). — I think he would make a very good journalist; has he ever thought of being *one*? — Dutch mostly employs the demonstratives *dat*, *die* or the personal *het*.

13. Sometimes *any* is used in English: I have no “Full dress” or “Court dress”, and the more I think about it the less I am disposed to have *any*. (Times Weekly.) — ... his talents, if he had *any* ... (Van Dongen, *English-Dutch*). — I had no weapons and he said I had better not try and get *any*. (E. Phillpots, *Freckles and Frenchy*). As in 12, Dutch employs mostly a demonstrative pronoun.

14. In some cases, when English uses no demonstrative, Dutch employs the partitive combination *van die*: These are *things that* won't bear mentioning (*van die dingen*). There are people who talk a lot about charity ... (*van die mensen*).

Sometimes *such* is equivalent to *van die*: We have to know twenty *such* things. (Chesterton). Compare § 16.

15. No demonstrative is used in such endearing combinations as dear Dr. Pritchard; darling Mabel; good old Captain Hanson, etc., where Dutch generally employs *die*.

² C. Stoffel, *Handleiding* II.

Note also the absence of a demonstr. in: I did not then examine details as one learns to do later on in life = zoals men *dat* later leert doen.

16. *Such* differs from the other demonstratives in not being a pure mark word but implying some element of quality, e.g.: A small troop of horsemen crossed the ford of the river Cairon ... the dragoons, for *such* they were — (want *dat* waren het. Note that *dat* and *such* are the predicate of the clause). — Niets is natuurlijker dan dat wij een gevoel van eerbied en liefde koesteren jegens *die* groote dichters zooals Shakespeare en Goethe, ... Nothing is more natural than that we should cherish a feeling of love and veneration for *such* great poets as Shakespeare and Goethe ... — *Such* is the popular belief = *Dat* gelooft het volk ervan.

Note. *As much* is also used sometimes, when Dutch employs *dit* or *dat*, e.g. Person had *dit* wel verwacht = Person had thought as *much*.

17. Sometimes English has a construction which is altogether different from the corresponding Dutch, e.g. *Die* oude Doggy Sam, *die* gelooft nog in vrijhandel. Eng.: Old Doggy Sam still believes in free trade, does old Doggy Sam. — *Die* Piet is een grapjas. Eng.: Peter is a funny boy, is Peter.

18. Back-reference to preceding sentences is made by means of *so* or *that*. *So* is common especially with verbs of hoping, saying, thinking, supposing, telling, etc.: Is he coming to-morrow? — I hope so, suppose so, told you so, etc.

No demonstrative is used for back-reference with some verbs, especially *to know*, *to try*, *to remember*, *to see*, e.g.: *Dat* weet ik wel = I know (Yes, I know) = 'k Weet het wel. But when stressed: *That* I know as well as you do. — *Dat* zal ik eens probeeren = I'll try = 'k Zal het eens probeeren.

Note that in referring back to preceding clauses or predicates *dat* is often rendered by *that* instead of *so* for emphasis. *I often said that* is much more emphatic than *I often said so* and implies a contrast with a preceding statement made by the interlocutor.

19. *That* may stand in what Jespersen calls extra-position, e.g. "Got your window broken, I see", said Valentin to the waiter as he paid the bill. — "Ah, yes Sir," he said, "Very odd thing, that, sir." (Chesterton, *The Innocence of Father Brown*).

Notes

1. Daar was in zijn optreden iets dat ons sterk aan het ancien régime deed denken. (Stoffel III, exercise 41); *iets* = *that* or *something*: There was *that* (*something*) in his manner ...

2. The interrogative-relatives *who* and *what* are often used in a semi-demonstrative function: Who steals my purse, steals trash. What cannot be cured must be endured. Natives possess their own sense of what is just and right. (Times Weekly.)

3. English sometimes employs a demonstrative plus a relative where in Dutch a simple dem. is sufficient: There were very few who cared to make inquiries. Those who did = die het wel deden, degenen die het deden. (*Jessica's First Prayer.*) Those who think must govern those that toil. (Pope.)

4. Note the use of *this* and *these* in time-adjuncts of present and future time: I have been waiting here *these two hours*. I shan't see you again *this day or two*.

5. *Those* is often used as a prop-word to adjectives and participles used as nouns: de pas aangekomenen = those who had just arrived (the newcomers); de door U genoemden = those mentioned by you; de boven-genoemden = those mentioned above.

6. *This, that and the other thing* = van alles en nog wat. *This person (man) or that*; some one or other = deze of gene. *This one and that* = deze en gene.

7. In pointing back to either of two persons just mentioned *the latter* and *the former* are used. Compare Dutch *laatstgenoemde (deze)* and *eerstgenoemde (gene)*.

Caesar and Alexander were great generals, *the latter* was a Macedonian, *the former* a Roman. (Stoffel, *Handleiding* II.)

8. Du. *die* for English *he*:

Why he cannot abide a gaping pig;

Why he, a harmless necessary cat,

Why he, a woollen bagpipe, ... etc. (*Merch. of Ven.*)

"Oh he!", said the nobleman, "he shall receive his half." (*The Fisherman and the Porter.*)

9. Sometimes *that* is used adverbially (as adverb of degree) in colloquial or vulgar style: One of the men was drunk ... He stood in the middle of the road, *that* bewildered. (Chesterton.)

10. 't Is met mijn vrouw nog niet *dat*: My wife is not quite *the thing* yet.

11. O, die jongelui van tegenwoordig, *dat* danst maar en *dat* maakt maar pret ... = they dance and they will make fun.

"Lord!" said the fat man, "ambiguous! And goes about with his own soap" ... En *dat* loopt (me) rond met zijn eigen zeep ... (Wells, *Mr. Ledbetter's Vacation.*)

12. *That's that.*

"Nothing like tact", he said to himself. "Tact does it. I'll be bound he never saw what I was after. Well, *that's that.*" (A. Christie, *Death in the Clouds.*)

He spoke with finality. Venetia thought: "*That's that.* It's a pity really. He is hopelessly prejudiced, but rather a dear." (ibid.)

He looked from one to the other of their interested faces and gave a little sigh. "Ah, well", he said, "*that's that.* Let us talk of other matters." (ibid.)

The farmers cannot afford to employ the men and *that's that*. (Y. Cloud, *The Houses in Between*.)

I won't have any one on the logger and *that's that* (en daarmee uit). (S. Maugham, *The Narrow Corner*.)

Master Ricket finally went off with his exhaust open and tears running down his cheeks. And *that was that*. (Ian Hay, *Housemaster*.)

13. Note the idiomatic use of *this* in: "Get out of *this*, will you!" Compare: "Get me out of *this*" (= this place). (Jerome, *Three Men in a Boat*.)

14. *This one* and *that one* are frequently used to strengthen the substantive idea of the plain *this* and *that*. "I have often wondered what these islands are for. — Now, you see, I am wiser. *This one* is for you. (Wells, *Mr. Ledbetter's Vacation*.) ... and on *that one* (= that one letter), if you could show clearly. (ibid.)

15. *This here* and *that there* are vulgarly used to emphasize the spatial difference of the two pronouns: *This here* book, *that there* house. Cf. *them* for *these* or *those*: *Them* apples are too sour to eat. (A. S. Hancock, *Essentials of Correct English*, p. 63.)

16. *Yon* and *yonder* are used in poetry (and provincially) for the Dutch *ginds*:

O wert thou in the cauld blast,
On yonder lea, on yonder lea. (Burns.)

Yon sun that sets upon the sea
We follow in his flight. (Byron.)

17. Note *that is*, in the sense of the Dutch *namelijk*: The omnibus is, in London at least, the truly popular vehicle; popular, *that is*, in the sense that it is in favour with all classes of the community. (H. Poutsma, *A Grammar of Late Modern English*, Ch. XXXVI, 10.)

18. *This much* and *that much*: *This much* I know; *that much* I can tell you.

19. *And (all) that* sometimes stands for a vague etc. (*enzovoort*): There might be some credit in being jolly with a wife, especially if the children had the measles *and that*. (Poutsma, 36, 10c.)

20. *That's all* = *anders niet, meer niet*: What had all that history stuff to do with it now? Just Old Chips with one of his queer ideas, *that's all*.

21. Dutch compounds of the pronominal adverb *daar* and prepositions are mostly rendered by *that* or *this*, preceded by prepositions: *daarna* = *after that*, archaically *thereafter*. *Daarop* is chiefly used as a conjunction, like *thereupon*.

22. Ellipsis of English demonstratives is common after auxiliaries, where Dutch requires the fuller forms with back-pointing pronouns: "I am really not a burglar", said Mr. Ledbetter. — "You *never will be*," said Mr. Bingham. (Wells, *Mr. Ledbetter's Vacation*.) Dutch: *Dat word jij (ook) nooit*.

23. English sometimes employs relative constructions for which Dutch has only a demonstrative equivalent: That is a dangerous state of mind *which we should miss no opportunity of correcting*, ... en wij mogen geen kans voorbij laten gaan om die te verbeteren. (*Times Weekly*.)

Compare: ... a kiss, *that she expired in giving*, = en toen ze die gaf, blies ze de laatste adem uit. (*Paradise and the Peri*.)

Groningen.

H. MULDER.

Notes and News

War Words from America. As was to be expected, our supply of new words and new meanings of old words connected with the war is running short.¹ It is with pleasure, therefore, that we acknowledge the receipt of the following contribution from Mr. William White, Instructor in English at the Pacific States University, Los Angeles, California. In his covering letter, dated June 2, 1940, Mr. White writes:

Here is a brief note on war words in America, which you may be able to use in your interesting section in *English Studies* on the influence of the present conflict on the English language.

During these trying times there are more important things to think of than philology, but I hope that your periodical still functions, and that this letter reaches you.

We now reproduce Mr. White's note:

More War Words: *Blitzkrieg*

Possibly the most popular word in the United States of those which have come into prominence since the War engulfed Europe is the German word *Blitzkrieg*. In its earliest form of usage in America it was italicized to indicate its foreign derivation and capitalized in correct German form: "... the Germans planned a *Blitzkrieg*, lightning war, to destroy Czechoslovakia..." (John Gunther, *Inside Europe*, New York, 1940, p. 117.)

Within the course of a few days I was able to find several variant forms of the word, while one constantly heard of "blitz" columns and "blitz" drives. For example: "Britain next! cry Blitzkriegers" (*The News*, Los Angeles, 15 May 1940, p. 1); and "He said the speed of the potential attack had increased from the average of five miles an hour ... to the blitz speeds of today — 200 to 300 miles an hour by air" (*Los Angeles Evening Herald & Express*, 16 May 1940, p. 1); and "Germany is pouring thousands of mechanized and motorized troops — her 'blitz' divisions — into the region ..." (*Los Angeles Times*, 17 May 1940, p. 1). The use of quotation marks is by no means consistent.

Two somewhat incorrect usages: (as a verb) "Law seniors 'blitzkrieg' last day of class" (*Southern California Daily Trojan*, 20 May 1940, p. 1), and (as an adjective) "[Germany] determined to force a decision in blitzkrieg time as well as manner ..." (*The News*, Los Angeles, 21 May 1940, p. 1). From a headline in a popular magazine: "Flash! Ten Million American Beauties Plan Beach Blitzkrieg" (*Girls in the News*, New York, vol. I, no. 5, p. 14, July 1940).

¹ When this note was already in print we received yet another batch of materials, which will be dealt with in the next issue.

Finally, there is this new word, "sitzkrieg", manufactured by a professor of geology at Columbia University, Dr. Douglas Johnson: "Germany wages a 'blitzkrieg' — a 'lightning war' — against the Allies because the Allies are conducting a 'sitzkrieg' — a 'sitdown war' or siege — against Germany" (*The News*, Los Angeles, 14 May 1940, p. 3; from Dr. Johnson's *Geology and Strategy in the Present War*, Geological Society of America, 1940).

No doubt "Blitzkrieg" has figured in English newspapers as well, though our contributors have failed to adduce examples. The rapidity with which the word, true to its meaning, has run into the moulds of English word-formation and syntax seems to have surprised Mr. White into calling its verbal and adjectival uses "somewhat incorrect" — though surely these conversions are in complete accord with the usual "behaviour" of English nouns. Professor Johnson's "sitzkrieg" — "sitdown war" — echoes a pre-war phase of industrial unrest — with its "sitdown" strikes — that seems very remote and unreal now. — Z.

Reviews

Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey. By E. CASADY. (The Modern Language Association of America, Revolving Fund Series, VIII.) xii + 257 pp. New York: The Modern Language Association of America. London: Milford. 1938. Price 11s. 6d.

Mr. Casady has written a full biography of Henry Howard, eldest son of the third Duke of Norfolk, who died on the scaffold in 1547, and who is known in the history of English literature as the first practitioner of blank verse, and as one of the first of a modified form of the Italian sonnet. The amount of space devoted respectively to the active and the literary aspects of his career would doubtless have met with the approval of Surrey himself, who, like Sidney forty years after him, was a soldier and a courtier first, and a poet only by way of relaxation.

Surrey's life is rightly described against the background of the revolutionary changes of his time. The son of the leader of the old Catholic nobility, he was bound to get into conflict with the 'new men' promoted by Henry VIII, and when with the latter's approaching death the question of a Regency during the minority of his son Edward became acute, the Party of Reform, on a trumped-up charge of high treason, contrived the downfall of both Norfolk and Surrey. Mr. Casady's view of the events he describes is grimly determinist: "He died for a political ideal which England was discarding, and his death was futile in proportion as all resistance to change, conservatism, is futile. His life and his death contributed to political England only as conservatism contributed to progress the futile but all important resistance which prevents too rapid change."

Surrey's positive contribution to English culture, however, was far greater, both in quality and quantity, than any conservative, or negative, influence he may have had on English politics; for to England he presented and exemplified a new standard of culture. Only by recognizing the forces of political and religious tradition in Surrey's environment, and by acknowledging the lack of all other tradition in England at this time, is it possible to understand how one man could in himself contain such a firm resistance to political change that he was willing to give up his life for his conservative convictions, yet even in doing so be among the first to accept change as exemplified in a new culture, the awakening of the intellect, and the rebirth of literature.

Although Mr. Casady is at some pains to elaborate Surrey's role as an embodiment of the new culture, he is neither a Wallace nor a Huizinga, and his book cannot stand comparison either with the former's *Life of Sir Philip Sidney* or the latter's *Waning of the Middle Ages*. Though evidently based on an exhaustive study of all the available documents, it somehow lacks historical imagination, and in style as well as vision is often unsatisfactory. Like others of his learned compatriots the author is fond of embellishing his pages with Shakespearean and other literary allusions, sometimes even improving upon his original, as when he includes among the traditions of chivalry the command: "above all else, unto thine own self be true until death." Wardour Street English is frequently resorted to so as to impart an archaic colouring to the narrative: "Would that this were true of her actions in abetting his enemies' attempts to destroy Surrey." Nor is he above the employment of the quasi-picturesque: "As often as the permission of their elders could be gained, to the hunting field would the young students go to follow the fleet staghounds, ever hopeful of being in at the death." On the other hand, there are many traces of mechanical composition where the author repeats either his own or somebody else's statements in almost identical phrasing.

In spite of these shortcomings, Mr. Casady's book will probably remain the standard biography of Surrey for many years to come. In Appendix I Surrey's contribution to English literature is discussed. Conflicting views on the prototype of his blank verse translation of two books of Virgil's *Æneid* are disposed of by the dictum: "He was writing under the influence of the Renaissance" — which, of course, is saying just nothing at all. In Appendix II the tradition of Surrey's love for the Faire Geraldine, so dear to nineteenth-century sentimentalism, is demolished and thereby relegated to the same literary lumber-room with the friendship of Sidney and Spenser, the activities of the Areopagus, and the mythical sorrows of Shakespeare.

Groningen.

R. W. ZANDVOORT.

Jan Jansz. Starter. Door J. H. BROUWER. Assen: Van Gorcum & Comp. N.V. 1940. f 3.50.

The poet Starter, who seems to have taken a certain pride in his English origin, does not rank among the leading authors of the Dutch Renaissance, but as one of the minor poets at the threshold of Holland's Golden Age he claims our interest in many ways. His work, though shallow, is always fluent and frequently melodious; he wrote new and often felicitous texts to beautiful tunes of Italian and English origin; his *Friesche Lusthof* came to be one of the most popular song-books in Holland during the 17th century. He must have had a good ear for telling and plastic phrases in popular dialects, which he turned to good use in his tragi-comedies and farces; when living at Leeuwarden he became interested in the Frisian language, which he used rather successfully in a few songs and a comical interlude. The restlessness of his life, his love of adventure, the strange way in which this versatile singer became mixed up in the political life and warfare of his times — his last calling was that of a laudatory poet to the fame-eager Duke of Mansfeldt, in whose army he died during a march into Hungary — have made him remembered among those of later times, who have been kinder to him than his contemporaries. Apart from his merits as a poet, however, he is chiefly interesting as a link between various cultural provinces, especially those of England, Holland and Friesland, and, as it now appears, Germany.

It is here that Mr. Brouwer's careful study sheds new light on problems often discussed before. Up till now it was generally believed that the poet was born in London, that when he was still a boy his parents owing to religious persecution had emigrated to Holland, that in Amsterdam as a member of the famous "rederijkers-kamer" *In liefde bloeyende* he had been permeated with Dutch culture and literature, so that, when he removed to Leeuwarden, he came to the rather benighted Frisian capital as a spreader of the values of a higher and freer life. Mr. Brouwer shows, first, that Starter's London birth is open to doubt, that the influence of his Amsterdam surroundings can scarcely have been deep, that the Frisian capital already before Starter possessed a high cultural standard especially in music, and that even drama did not come with Starter as a strange and new thing; he makes it clear that Starter did not create an artistic sphere at Leeuwarden, but that this sphere, present before his arrival, did much to inspire and ripen his talents. Perhaps Mr. Brouwer overstresses his case here a little; for if Starter borrowed from life here as elsewhere, he certainly rose high above his contemporaries in the Leeuwarden milieu in poetical creation. It is only natural that when afterwards the quiet lights of the Frisian capital had been forgotten, Starter's meteor was still remembered.

In his plays Starter no doubt imitated English and Dutch examples; here it is interesting to note that the place where Starter became acquainted with English drama was in all probability Frankfort in Germany, where the "Messe" must have been a true exchange of cultural as well as material

goods, no less than three English companies occasionally performing plays there. Even for so patient an investigator as Mr. Brouwer it is too much to disentangle Starter's original contribution to Dutch drama from what he took over from his models; here, too, Starter appears as a borrower and spender on a generous scale. But neither as a playwright can he be called a mere imitator: it is clear that he possessed dramatic skill from the way he condenses his matter and builds up his vivid dialogue.

Mr. Brouwer's study might have done more justice to Starter as man and poet; he himself is aware that his quiet exposition conveys too little of the restlessness and swiftness of Starter's career and work. Here again biographical detail and comparisons of literary forms tend to obscure instead of bringing out the poet's merits. But as a specimen of literary research Mr. Brouwer's book deserves all praise, and should be recommended to everybody interested in the life and work of this adventurous singer, though perhaps it will most appeal to Frisians, in whose literature Starter came to be a pioneer.

Eindhoven.

D. KALMA.

Current Literature: 1939

I. Fiction, Drama and Poetry

The tension in international politics throughout the earlier part of the year 1939, culminating in the outbreak of war in September, has left its mark on the literature produced during that period, much of which reflects the uneasiness, the confusion and the sense of impending catastrophe which overhung the greater part of Europe. As might be expected, a number of writers drew their material directly from contemporary events and the contemporary social and political scene, but works of a more detached character have not been lacking.

In the first place mention must be made of the appearance of a long-awaited novel of James Joyce. Having been in process of composition for some years, with the tentative title *Work in Progress* (under this title sections of it have appeared from time to time in magazines), it is now published as *Finnegan's Wake* (Faber & Faber, 25/—). Like many another reviewer of it, the present writer must confess that it has made little impression upon him save that of incomprehensibility. A contributor to a well known English newspaper recently characterised its style as "the language of a man speaking, or trying to speak, through an anaesthetic", and that, one feels, is just how it will strike most people who read it. It is by far the most obscure work that Joyce has ever written, and that is saying a good deal!

Storm Jameson's *Farewell Night, Welcome Day* (Cassell, 7/6) is well written but rather depressing. It is the story of a strong-willed,

somewhat selfish woman, who has made an unhappy marriage with a sea-captain but tries to hide her failure from the outside world, though she cannot hide it from herself and her family. We first meet her in the nineties of the last century; we follow her life through to comparatively recent times, when she dies embittered and disappointed, having done little to win the sympathy of her children and having lost her favourite son, when he was still but a young man, in the last war. Sylvia Russell (for that is the woman's name) had inherited many of her mother's characteristics — her coldness, her impulsiveness and her egotism, and she tended to set her life by that of her mother. Her own daughter, in exactly the same way, becomes centred in her, and this mysterious, uncanny influence, working through the generations, is the theme of the book, a theme which Miss Jameson treats with skill and subtlety. But it is a joyless, loveless existence that she portrays, and none of the characters are really attractive. Russell is sullen and somewhat boorish, but one feels sympathy for him. His wife is eccentric and unimaginative, and all her children are spoiled. The author is clearly quite sincere in her presentation of the particular facet of life that she wishes us to see, and she does not write without feeling. Indeed, there is present a sense of pity and of the transitoriness of human life. But the atmosphere is too intense and austere, and the tone too cynical.

Aldous Huxley's latest novel *After Many a Summer* (Chatto & Windus, 7/6) harks back to the theme of *Brave New World* — the moral and spiritual bankruptcy of twentieth-century civilisation, which can only think in terms of the material and the sensual. The setting is, for the main part, American, though towards the end we move to England. The central figure is the wealthy though rather vulgar and unimaginative "big business" man, Jo Stoyte, and as secondary characters we have the student Jeremy Pordage and Dr. Obispo, who is conducting experiments to prolong the span of human life. But the story, fantastic and farcical as it is, is only a vehicle for the symbolic representation of some of the vital problems that confront the human race today: the problems of good and evil, liberty and dictatorship, peace and war, illusion and reality; and there are frequent philosophical digressions embodying some of the views expressed in the same author's earlier *Ends and Means*. A sentence which frequently recurs is the dictum "God is not mocked", and that can be taken as symbolising the core of the novel, which is written with all Mr. Huxley's usual ingenuity, imagination and cleverness.

Those who have read Francis Brett Young's *They Seek a Country* will remember young John Grafton, who, transported from England as a criminal, settled in South Africa and married a Boer wife. In Mr. Brett Young's latest book *The City of Gold* (Heinemann, 8/6) we meet the same John Grafton and his wife in later life. The main part of the story, however, is concerned not with them but with their three grown-up sons, all widely different in character but all possessed of the same tenacity, courage and indomitable will-power of their father. The

eldest is attached to the quiet, if not too exciting, ways of the Boer farmers amongst whom he was brought up, and looks with distrust upon the "get rich quick" tendencies that he sees eating into the life of his people since the rush for gold began. The youngest, on the other hand, becomes impatient with the slow pace and restricted opportunities of his father's home and goes to seek adventures in the diggings. He finds it a hard struggle, with many disappointments, but he persists, and finally has his reward. And the second of John's sons treads the middle way, the way of conciliation and co-operation with the British interests which to his brothers seem to conflict with those of the Boers and are therefore to be resisted. All three figures are well and sympathetically drawn; but they are not the only characters of interest, for besides the stolid Boer farmers and the motley crowd of speculators, which, as it were, form the background to the tale and give it its essential atmosphere, we meet some of the famous historical figures of the day — Paul Kruger, Cecil Rhodes and L. S. Jameson, with whose unfortunate and misguided raid the story comes to a conclusion. In one sense, then, the novel is a historical one: it has a historical setting, introduces historical characters and gives what is, presumably, a fairly faithful picture of the life, problems and politics of South Africa during a crucial period of her development. And overshadowing it all, in the background, is Johannesburg, "the city of gold", which symbolises the new civilisation and all that it is bringing in its train. But despite this historical element, Mr. Brett Young's story is, in its essentials, still a personal one, of how those events which were to have so great a significance for both South Africa and Great Britain, affected the lives and characters of the ordinary human beings who became involved in them. It is well written, the characters are drawn with understanding and humanity, and the background of Boer life is vividly and convincingly presented. The chief criticism that might be levelled against it is that it is too long; but that is a fault common to many modern works of fiction.

Readers of *Magnolia Street* will not need to be reminded of Louis Golding's merits as a novelist. That work established him as one of the outstanding writers of the present day. In his new book *Mr. Emmanuel* (Rich & Cowan, 8/6) he introduces us to the same locality for a few chapters, then suddenly we are transported to Germany, where the major part of the story is set, and finally we come back to the peace and quiet of Magnolia Street once more. There are touches of melodrama in it, but taken as a whole it is a well written novel, moving and terrifying, yet showing a fine appreciation of the truly human qualities of character. Isaac Emmanuel, a gentle, generous, loveable old man, just about to retire from his position on the Jewish Board of Guardians after a long life of active work for it, is one of the most affable and attractive of all the dwellers in Magnolia Street, friendly with his neighbours and respected by them all. But he has had his sorrows in life. Until the moment that the story opens he has been a very ordinary and obscure person, but suddenly, to his own surprise no less than that of everyone else, he becomes

a hero. It is a little refugee boy, Bruno, that is the cause of it all. He is worrying because he has ceased receiving letters from his mother, who was not allowed to leave Berlin with him, and Mr. Emmanuel sets off for Germany to try and discover her whereabouts. He encounters all the humiliation of ostracism on account of his race (albeit he finds individual Germans who are kind and helpful, and even apologetic for their régime), falls into the hands of the Gestapo, is falsely accused of being implicated in a Jewish spy plot and the murder of a German consular official in Switzerland, and finally, after a great deal of difficulty, finds Bruno's mother living with a Nazi high official and anxious to forget her earlier Jewish connexions.

So brief a summary as this can give no indication of the tremendous sweep of the book or of the tenderness, the poignancy and the intensity of it. There are sensational passages in it, it is true, and one feels that the portraits of the agents of the secret police, as well as that of the brutal Herr Heinkes, are overdrawn, while there is more than a suspicion of pandering to the popular desire for scandal and sensation in the insistence on secret liaisons between Nazi officials and women of non-Aryan connexions. But Mr. Emmanuel himself is a wonderfully drawn character: simple, inoffensive, good-natured, yet heroically dogged and persevering. Through all his suffering and humiliation there is nothing of hatred or anger in him: only love, humanity, tenderness and great-hearted good humour. He is a person whom everyone will take to, and it is he who makes the story, a story which will stand amongst Mr. Golding's best work.

Nettles to My Head (Duckworth, 7/6), Josephine Kamm's latest contribution to literature, is of a different type. Its background, like that of the work just dealt with, is the present-day persecution of the Jews, but it is not a novel with a purpose in the strict sense of that term. The central figure is a young Jewess, Enid Abel. When we first meet her she is a schoolgirl of sixteen, living with her mother in an English boarding-house. As we follow her development from adolescence to womanhood we get a convincing and sometimes poignant picture of the reactions of her mind to the joys and the sorrows of the world around her. Always conscious as she is of the sufferings of her race, she is never completely happy, though she has friends who try to understand her and to lighten her worries, notably her mother, her grandfather and a school-mistress friend. This is a novel of character and of conflicting forces at work in the inner life of an individual. The setting is modern, but the theme is an old one; and in spite of the predominantly serious note there is plenty of quiet humour and satire on human follies and foibles.

Christopher Isherwood's *Goodbye to Berlin* (Hogarth Press, 7/6) consists of six short stories or sketches depicting the Berlin of the last years before the Nazi revolution; it is thus complementary to the same author's novel *Mr. Norris Changes Trains*, which appeared about four years ago. The scenes include family life, slums and tenements, boarding-houses, artists' studios, restaurants and night-clubs. Tragedy mingles with

comedy, the seamy side of life with the more normal. In spite of the superficial air of gaiety and good-fellowship, one is conscious all the time of an atmosphere of despair, poverty and confusion. It is the picture of a society without any stable foundations, living merely from day to day and not daring to think on what the morrow may bring forth. The under-current of political ferment and unrest gathers force as we proceed from one episode to another, until, by the time we reach the end of the book, the stage is fully set for the National-Socialist rise to power. The picture is skilfully drawn though one must confess that at times it becomes a little tedious.

Another work not altogether irrelevant to present-day conditions is *The Blood of the Martyrs*, by Naomi Mitchison (Constable, 8/6), a historical novel dealing with the conflict between the totalitarian power of the Roman Empire at the height of its dominion, and the early Christians, with their belief in the rights of the individual. It is a book full of movement and incident; there is a whole array of varied characters, including the apostle Paul and Jesus' disciple Luke; and the social background of imperial Rome is well sketched in. Running through the story is a sense of mighty conflicting forces, the struggle of principles, vested interests and what today would be called rival ideologies. Clearly, though the scene is laid in a period nearly two thousand years ago, the theme has a contemporary application.

Not all novelists, however, have been occupied with serious issues. In *Merlin Bay* (Macmillan, 7/6) Richmal Crompton has written a book which is first and foremost a study of human nature in its gentler and lighter moods. *Merlin Bay* is supposed to be a seaside resort in Cornwall. We first hear of it when, in the opening chapter, we meet the elderly Mrs. Paget in a first class compartment of a railway train, on her way to visit a married daughter who lives there. Mrs. Paget had spent her honeymoon at *Merlin Bay* some fifty years previously. It was then a tiny, picturesque fishing-village; it has now become a fair-sized seaside resort, with hotels, boarding-houses and all the other amenities that modern visitors demand. Against this background is set the story of the Paget family. In many ways it is a very ordinary family, but the lives and the personalities of its members are full of interest, from that of old Mr. Paget herself down to her daughter's six children and their various aunts and uncles. The tale is told with verve and skill and the characters are drawn with a confidence and a lightness of touch which makes them live. Whether she is dealing with the young, the middle-aged or the elderly, Miss Crompton shows an understanding of them and their lives as a novelist should. *Merlin Bay* will be found pleasant reading. It is not entirely free from sorrow, sadness and tragedy of a lighter kind (if it was it would not be true to life), but the prevailing note is one of happiness.

R. H. Mottram's *You Can't Have It Back* (Hutchinson, 7/6) is also well worth reading. Its hero is the middle-aged, retired director of a College of Science and Arts which, established in the middle of the

Victorian era, is just closing down when the story opens, in order to make room for something more modern and up-to-date. He falls in love with one of the students, much younger than he is, but while she has gone to visit relatives in Belgium he meets an old love of his youth, now a middle-aged woman, and for a while he is attracted back to her. But as soon as Emmeline, the young girl, returns and goes to see him at the seaside hotel where he is staying he comes to realise that he will never be able to recapture the passion he once felt for his former love, for it is only youth which awakens passions, and when it is once gone you can't have it back. So he finds romance with Emmeline. The story is well told; the action moves briskly and there are no superfluous episodes, while the dialogue is vivacious and natural. Some of the minor characters are even better drawn than the main ones, particularly the old Belgian aunt Berthe, a type which Mr. Mottram previously portrayed in *The Spanish Farm*.

A. E. Coppard has for long been recognised as one of the modern masters of the short story, and whenever a new volume appears from his pen one can be sure that it will contain something worth reading. *You Never Know, Do You? And Other Tales* (Methuen, 7/6) consists of twenty-three tales of varying types, but all told with a verve and an ingenuity that are peculiarly the author's own. Dealing as he does in the most casual way with the most unlikely happenings, Mr. Coppard sustains the reader's interest to the very end, for one never quite knows how things are going to turn out. Some of these tales are humorous, some sensational, some a little gruesome, others just odd and whimsical; but in whatever strain he is writing the author writes well and with consummate artistry. This is a volume to be recommended to all types of readers, for with its wide range of subjects and types there should be something in it to suit all tastes; and it has the advantage of all collections of short stories, of course, that it can be taken up in an odd half-hour and then put by until leisure again offers.

Attention should also be directed to the literary remains of Katherine Mansfield, which have been collected and edited by J. Middleton Murry under title *The Scrapbook of Katherine Mansfield* (Constable, 7/6). The volume is composed of various odds and ends — stray observations, poems, unfinished essays, extracts from her journal, and a few unposted letters etc.; and they belong to all periods of her life, from 1905 to 1922. There is no attempt at classification other than on a purely chronological basis; but the editor considers this the best method, since it serves to provide something of a mental portrait of Katherine Mansfield at the various stages of her development. Besides this, it enables us to relate these fragments to her published work, upon which some of them throw interesting sidelights.

In the field of the theatre the year has not been productive of a great deal of really important or first-class work, but several pieces call for notice here. T. S. Eliot has by now become known as one of the most

important of our modern experimenters in the theatre, especially in the realm of the development of a new poetic drama. *The Family Reunion* (Faber & Faber, 7/6) is rather disappointing and falls far short of the author's achievement in *Murder in the Cathedral*. The theme is that of the stir and comment created amongst an English middle-class family by the arrival amongst them of a son who, it is suspected, connived at the "suicide" of his wife at sea; but it is the technique rather than the theme that matters in such a play as this, and it is the technique that leaves us puzzled and wondering. The situations, like the plot itself, are quite naturalistic and such as could be found in many a modern play; the dialogue is in verse, however, yet verse which is so colloquial and unpoetic that superficially it might be taken for prose. Add to this that none of the scenes are markedly dramatic in character and that interspersed amongst the rather prosaic and commonplace dialogue are passages of choric commentary on what the author evidently intends us to understand are the underlying realities of the piece, and it will be seen that we have a play which is not at all easy either to grasp, even at a second or third reading, or to assess. One is conscious of something of a pessimistic and cynical note running through it, and a sense of unreality. The characters are statuesque in conception, yet always we feel that their "selves" which appear on the surface and which are known to the world and to each other are not their real selves; that in all of them there is a hidden, unexpressed life, striving for realisation. Is it again the shams, the hollowness and the unreality of modern life that Mr. Eliot is symbolically exposing here? Perhaps it is; but if so, it is not easily apparent. *The Family Reunion* is a play which should certainly be read, but one must be prepared to do a good deal of thinking and interpreting in connexion with it.

Following upon *Time and the Conways* and *I Have Been Here Before* J. B. Priestley has now produced another "time play" in *Johnson Over Jordan* (Heinemann, 7/6). Critics have called it a play about death; but although it opens with the funeral of the central character, it would be more correctly described, as Mr. Priestley himself remarks in an appendix, as a play about life, for in it we are taken outside the circumscribed world of space and time and introduced to a four-dimensional world. Through a kind of dream-consciousness which he experiences after death, Robert Johnson, an ordinary middle-class citizen of a typical English suburb, becomes aware of the various stages in the development of his personality during his life-time. He lives over again, within a comparatively short period, his childhood, youth and manhood, and sees in their reality all the subconscious motives which then actuated him but of which he was at the time not fully aware. The lower desires and impulses appear in all their deformity, and then he discovers those influences which had awakened his better self and in virtue of which he may be said to have attained salvation, though not perhaps in the orthodox sense of that term. So he departs happily for the great unknown beyond, against a depth of blue sky, spangled with stars.

The play, which is something of a modern morality and in which many of the figures are symbolic, is a powerful and moving one. It is the mediaeval *Everyman* written in terms of modern thought, and gives much food for speculation. The dialogue, as in several of Mr. Priestley's other recent plays, is closely condensed, all inessentials having been eliminated, while the author has prefaced each act by a short description of the sensations that an audience might feel if they could see it on the stage, thus attempting to compensate for the loss of scenic effects etc. which must inevitably arise from the reading of a work which was intended primarily for dramatic presentation. There is also an appendix explaining the origin, development and stage-history of the play, as well as its theme.

Two plays by Bernard Shaw have also appeared during the period under review. *Geneva* (Constable, 5/—), first performed at the 1938 Malvern Festival, is a satire on "International Justice", power politics and dictatorship. It hardly achieves the standard of Shaw's earlier work, though it is full of entertainment, and the illustrations by Feliks Topolski make an added attraction. The best work lies in the third act, in which we find something of the subtlety of the trial scene of *St. Joan*, allied to Mr. Shaw's usual wit and humour. Though the play is described as "a fancied page of history", and in the stricter sense, no doubt, the characters are fictitious, or at most symbolic, it is not difficult to recognise in some of them a marked resemblance to living statesmen and politicians.

Its companion volume, *In Good King Charles's Golden Days* (Constable, 5/—), suffers from some of the same defects as *Geneva*, though, also like that piece, it contains passages of brilliant dialogue. A play dealing with the reign of the Merry Monarch, Charles II, might well have been crowded with characters of all types; but very wisely Mr. Shaw selects only a few. There is the King himself, an intelligent, courteous and affable person, not the mere amorous trifler of the popular historian; there are also the Duke of York (afterwards James II), Sir Isaac Newton, George Fox, Nell Gwynn and two or three other well known figures. In the case of Fox and Newton Mr. Shaw has not altogether escaped the temptation to caricature, but Nell Gwynn, on the other hand, like Charles himself, has been humanised. In essence what the author has done is to show the serious characters of history as, in many ways, ludicrous because of their obsession with serious things, while the so-called triflers he has shown as not so trifling after all.

Then there is Leonard Woolf's *The Hotel* (Hogarth Press, 5/—), which centres around the story of how a Continental hotel proprietor is involved in a plot to supply munitions to both sides in the Spanish Civil War, and how finally, in the complications that ensue, his son is shot and his hotel blown up. There is a good deal of satire on contemporary politics and personalities, and there is comedy as well as tragedy in it; but the play is not merely an exciting and topical stage-piece. Underlying it are wider issues than appear on the surface; it is, in effect, an exposure of the falsity of the doctrine that the end justifies the means. It is not a

great play, but it is full of lively interest and expounds its theme without becoming in any way academic.

Stephen Spender has already become known as one of the more promising of our younger generation of poets, though his output of work has not been prolific. *The Still Centre* (Faber & Faber, 6/—) contains all the most important of his poems which have been written since September 1934, when the second edition of his previous (and only) collection was published.¹ One or two earlier pieces here appear in revised form, but for the most part it is new work. All the poems are the records of personal experience. The restraint, the intensity of feeling, the strength, of versification and of diction which we noted in the former volume, appear here once again; so do the essentially modernist technique and the gift of psychological insight. "I think", writes Mr. Spender, "that there is a certain pressure of external events on poets today making them tend to write about what is outside their own limited experience. ... For this reason, in my most recent poems I have deliberately turned back to a kind of writing which is more personal." The best illustration of this fact is to be found in those poems (forming a section of their own) which arose out of the Spanish Civil War. The author's own political sympathies do not intrude; it is the grimness, the pity, the horror of war, in its universal aspect, that form the themes of the several poems. The volume may not be, as its publishers rather extravagantly claim, "one of the most interesting literary events of the year", but it is certainly an important one.

Even more markedly "modern" than Mr. Spender is Louis MacNeice, who has published his third volume of verse under the title *Autumn Journal* (Faber & Faber, 6/—). This is different from anything its author has written before. He himself describes it as "both a panorama and a confession of faith", yet in the strictest sense it is neither of these. Rather it is a record of Mr. MacNeice's spiritual, intellectual and emotional reactions to his experiences during the five months from August to December 1938: his work at Oxford, his studies, the countryside, holidays abroad, the Czecho-Slovak crisis and (again) the Spanish war. Though there is a good deal of description in it, of the symbolic, impressionist kind, after the early style of T. S. Eliot, it is actually a subjective poem, all the author's different "selves" speaking out in turn. Sensitiveness, cynicism, minute observation, a quick eye for the beautiful and a correspondingly quick distaste for the squalid and unlovely, are all characteristics of Mr. MacNeice's style. Behind his compressed, concise diction there is a certain strength and energy; the spirit of parody is not entirely absent, while the employment of a system of symbolism which amounts almost to conceit gives the author an affinity with the metaphysical poets of the seventeenth century. His faith is an optimistic one, in the face of great difficulties and depressing circumstances.

¹ See *E. S.* xvii, 3. (1935).

There is no river of the dead or Lethe,
 Tonight we sleep
 On the banks of Rubicon — the die is cast;
 There will be time to audit
 The accounts later, there will be sunlight later,
 And the equation will come out at last.

It may be added that much light may be thrown upon this poem if it is read side by side with the same author's *Modern Poetry, A Personal Essay*, published in 1938 and noticed in *E.S.* for August 1939.

Most of the poetry called forth by the Spanish Civil War has come from the left school of writers (both Mr. Spender and Mr. MacNeice belong to that school), whose sympathies were with the Republican Government; but in *Flowering Rifle* (Longmans, 6/—) Roy Campbell, the South African poet, sings the praises of the Nationalist cause. As in much of Mr. Campbell's earlier poetry, there are many echoes of eighteenth-century technique: the heroic couplet measure, a marked satirical and didactic strain and a certain neo-classical energy of expression. His diction is not always too felicitous, for he frequently falls into mere slang and other modern crudities; nor is his work free from some of that very savagery and intolerance which he condemns in his opponents. For instance, his sneers, both in his preface and in the poem itself, at liberalism and the humanitarianism which feels sympathy for the weak, the down-trodden and the oppressed, will hardly commend themselves to an unprejudiced reader. Yet if we can free ourselves from the unpleasant savour which these things leave we cannot fail to discern merits in the poem. Of Mr. Campbell's sincerity there is no doubt, and it comes from personal experience. There is passion in his verse, and there is enthusiasm. It is true, one is apt to gain the impression that all the heroism and idealism was on one side, but that, no doubt, is inevitable when one is writing of a crusade, for as such Mr. Campbell sees General Franco's fight. The poem is a long one (it runs to 144 pages) and it is not uniform in quality, but there are passages of description which should find a place in any future anthology of twentieth-century poetry. The poet does succeed, too, in producing a sense of mighty contending forces sweeping over a country where stalk ruin, starvation, terror and fear.

Another product of the Spanish War was Christopher Caudwell, who was killed while fighting on the Republican side. He first came into prominence with the volume *Illusion and Reality*, noticed in this journal in December 1938. His *Poems* (The Bodley Head, 6/—) reveal him as not only a theorist but also a creative writer of more than usual merit. Metaphysical in character, they are, as the collector of them has observed the kind of poems that Donne might have written had he been faced by the problems of the modern world. The author was still a young man (not yet thirty years of age) when he died, but his verses reveal a depth of understanding and feeling far in advance of his years. Sometimes cynical, sometimes mockingly humorous, sometimes pathetic, they reflect

the conflicts and struggles of a perplexed yet sensitive mind. Communist in his sympathies, he hurled himself relentlessly into the political struggle, yet all the time his abilities were not those of the propagandist, the pamphleteer or the military crusader, but of the artist. All his poems bear the stamp of sincerity, of conviction and of deep-felt emotions. The present volume is only a selection of what he left behind him in manuscript, but it is a selection of the best.

From these writers of turmoil and of spiritual and ideological conflicts, we turn to an author of a very different kind. John Gawsworth is one of the most distinguished and most individual of our modern poets, and his talent has recently been recognised by the award of the Benson Medal of the Royal Society of Literature. His slender volume of *New Poems* (Martin Secker, 5/—) is in every respect worthy of such an award. None of the pieces is very long, but all are pure poetry, in which feeling, vision, diction and metrical skill are perfectly blended. Mr. Gawsworth possesses the sense of wonder as few other writers of our day do. He labours not for novelty of expression; there is nothing of the ultra-modernist about him, and his verse is little affected by the external mutability of the world. These are first and foremost personal pieces, in the best sense of the term. As Lascelles Abercrombie declares in a prefatory note, "there is real, firm, shapely and self-subsisting beauty in what he writes", and we must admire him for it. Behind all external events he discerns the essential spiritual significance and translates it into terms of poetry — poetry of which the chief characteristics are restraint, dignity, feeling and euphony.

Lord Gorrell's volume *The Last of the English* (Murray, 6/—) takes its title from a poetic play in three episodes with which it concludes, and which seeks to show the essential English spirit perpetuated through the ages, from the days of Harold, the last of the Saxon kings, through Tudor times, on to the ordinary English man and woman of today. There are passages of blank verse in it of great poetic merit; but the quality of the dialogue in all the episodes is not consistently high. Much more attractive are the poems which make up the rest of the volume. They are all quite brief but they are all impregnated with genuine emotion, with a sense of beauty and with an atmosphere of calm and quiet. Like Mr. Gawsworth, Lord Gorrell is no modernist. He writes in the best tradition of English verse and his sense of melody and music rarely fails him.

Amongst other poetry of the year should be noticed Humbert Wolfe's *Out of Great Tribulation* (Gollancz, 7/6), verses, as he himself declares, "written out of the heart's bitterness", and moving alike for their sensitiveness to all that is lovely and for their passionate sincerity of utterance. Not all of them, however, express bitterness, grief or disappointment. There are verses which show their author in a more buoyant mood, and there is a fine elegiac poem to G. K. Chesterton. Then there is Christopher Hassall's *Crisis* (Heinemann, 3/6), which consists of forty-two sonnets expressive of their author's mental and spiritual reactions

to the anxieties and perplexities of the ten months before the outbreak of war. They are not all written in one mood: there is despair, anger, pity, irony, even humour, and finally hope; but all display a skilfulness of diction and a power of restraint. Mr. Hassall possesses many of the virtues of the older, traditional poets, with the spirit and the passion of the younger writers of our day. It may be that he marks the beginning of a new school.

Mention should also be made of Sturge Moore's *The Unknown Known* (Martin Secker, 6/—), a blank verse rendering of the ancient story of Sigurd and Brynhild. A blend of the mythical with the essentially human element, it is written in language which is full of music and is touched with the imaginative glow of the true poet, while it contains striking verbal pictures of great clarity. The volume also includes some shorter poems.

A Perpetual Memory and Other Poems, by Sir Henry Newbolt (Murray, 3/6) is a small volume of verses found amongst their author's papers after his death. Every piece is quite brief and all are marked by those characteristics which one has come to associate with the poetry of Newbolt: a quiet, classical precision, a finish, a scrupulousness of diction and a strong sense of rhythm. Love, devotion, compassion are their incentives; they are all animated, too, by a certain youthfulness and an appreciation of the joys, desires and emotions of youth, and this in spite of the fact that most of them were written in the last years of a long life. This little volume will certainly stand among the choicest poetry of the year.

As regards "collected editions" (of which, this time, there have been remarkably few) *The Collected Poems of A. E. Housman* (Jonathan Cape, 7/6) stands out prominently and calls for notice, while the most important anthology of the year is Robert Lynd's *Modern Poetry* (Nelson, 7/6), a counterpart to Methuen's earlier *Anthology of Modern Verse*, which, published in 1918, is now no longer modern. Every author represented in Mr. Lynd's book was writing when George V came to the throne or has commenced writing since. Thus the anthology extends from Hardy and Bridges to the very recent poets like Day-Lewis, Auden and Spender. It can be fairly said that the great majority of the pieces included have enduring qualities. Many well-known poems will be found, but so will a number of unfamiliar ones, for though Mr. Lynd has adopted poetic merit as his sole criterion, he has, where possible, printed less known examples of an author's work in preference to those which are more familiar. But good work has never been sacrificed to second-rate merely for the sake of achieving novelty. Nor has the compiler allowed his own preferences amongst poets or fashions in versification to influence unduly the choice of material. On the whole the anthology is an excellent one, and representative of all the writers of the modern age who really matter.

Sheffield.

FREDERICK T. WOOD.

Signior Brabantio, Plaintiff

Othello's elopement with Desdemona was a terrible stigma upon the reputation of Brabantio, both as an individual and as the head of a great family,¹ so terrible a stigma that he died of grief and shame; and, when Roderigo and Iago rouse him from his bed to tell him that his only daughter has run off to a Moor under the notorious² escort of a gondolier, his first reaction is outraged disbelief, then shame and fury, combined with such excuse as he can make for her — the reiterated declaration that she cannot have been her normal self, that she was bewitched or drugged. He would even prefer that she had wedded the worthless Roderigo.³ He hastily collects his relatives and armed retainers, seeks out Othello, and hales him as a "thief" before the Council, even breaking into the agenda of an extraordinary midnight session to set forth his complaint. The wickedness of elopement was widely recognized⁴; Gouge even declared it one of the fundamental sins that caused the Flood⁵; and, indeed, as Brabantio states, such marriages would corrupt the pure strain of the Venetian aristocracy, and thus in time make the issue of "Bond-slaves and pagans" the oligarchs of Venice⁶. An abortive trial follows that must have been a trying problem for the dramatist: Brabantio clearly had a case with which any Elizabethan father would have sympathized; and yet Shakespeare, as in *Romeo and Juliet*, must hold the sympathy of the audience for the lovers, and, furthermore, must settle the whole matter in short order to get the main plot started. His source in Cinthio, moreover, gave no help, for it contains none of this material. Shakespeare, therefore, invented the Turkish attack on Cyprus to motivate at once the strange decision in favour of Othello and the unusual haste with which it was pronounced, for court procedure in general was notoriously slow⁷. Brabantio must be, in effect, non-suited before the main action of the play could start; and the legal and dramatic detail by which this is accomplished is fundamental to the tragedy, which could hardly have taken place, had the aggrieved father either annulled the marriage, as Iago suggested⁸, or thrown Othello into prison for an indefinite time. Despite the importance of these scenes, even those critics who specialize in Shakespeare's legal knowledge have generally neglected them. Lord Campbell briefly touches on the trial,

¹ See the present author, "Desdemona", *R.L.C.*, XIII, 346 *et seq.*

² See the present author, "Some Details of Local Color in *Othello*", *Sh. Jhb.*, LXVIII, 125-126.

³ *Othello*, ed. Aldis Wright, I, i, 176.

⁴ See "Desdemona", *cit. sup.*

⁵ W. Gouge, *Domesticall Duties*, London, 1622, 450 *et seq.*

⁶ *Othello*, I, ii, 98-99.

⁷ *Ibid.*, I, ii, 85-87.

⁸ *Ibid.*, I, ii, 11 *et seq.*

cites the statute of 33 Henry VII [sic] c. 8 against conjuration, and notes that the decision was dictated by political necessity⁹; and even as recent a study as Keeton's omits the subject entirely.¹⁰ A full treatment of the problem should first review the legality of the marriage and Brabantio's position regarding it and then take up the somewhat informal trial of Othello.

As soon as Brabantio discovers that his daughter has actually gone, he demands of Roderigo whether she is really married to the Moor; and, hearing that she is, he bitterly laments that his own flesh and blood should commit such an outrage against him. A modern father might suppose that marriage would mend matters; but, to the high-born Elizabethan, an indiscretion was preferable to a misalliance; for the former might possibly be concealed, whereas the latter was a permanent and public blot on the family scutcheon and especially on the father's capability and honor. Moreover, a marriage could not easily be dissolved. The nature of the ceremony, if there were any, that united Othello and Desdemona is not discussed; but, according to the Common Law of England, "No ceremony, no priest, no physical consummation was required,"¹¹ though Canon Law required consummation¹². Henry Swinburne, the chief authority on marriage law, whose *Treatise* was composed about 1600¹³, declared that in spousals *de præsenti*¹⁴, especially if followed by cohabitation (for this would meet the requirement of Canon Law also):

Albeit there be no Witnesses of the Contract, yet the parties having verily (though secretly) Contracted Matrimony, they are very Man and Wife before God; neither can either of them with safe Conscience Marry elsewhere, so long as the other party liveth.¹⁵

Shakespeare, moreover, in other plays, regularly recognizes betrothal as a legal marriage¹⁶; and he regularly uses *spousal* and *espouse* to signify a full legal marriage. Thus a ceremony, civil or religious, was immaterial; there need be no signatures or seals, no witnesses, and according to Common Law, not even consummation. Since only a verbal statement was essential, every presumption pointed to the legality of Desdemona's marriage.

Iago, like Brabantio, enquires whether the two are "fast married"¹⁷; and he tries to arouse Othello's fears that the injured father will "divorce" the lovers. As a "divorce" was practically out of the question in ecclesiastical law, Iago is doubtless using the word loosely, and refers to

⁹ John Lord Campbell, *Shakespeare's Legal Acquirements*, London, 1859, 92-93.

¹⁰ G. W. Keeton, *Shakespeare and his Legal Problems*, London, 1930.

¹¹ See A. Underhill in *Shakespeare's England*, Oxford, 1917, II, 407.

¹² See W. L. Scott, "Nullity of Marriage in Canon Law and English Law", *U. of Toronto Law Jour.*, II, 319 et seq.

¹³ See C. L. Powell, *English Domestic Relations, 1487-1653*, New York, 1917, 3 and 251.

¹⁴ I.e. a statement of wedlock phrased in the present tense by the two parties.

¹⁵ H. Swinburne, *Treatise of Spousals*, London, 1686, 87 and *passim*.

¹⁶ *Shakespeare's England*, ed. cit., I, 407; and H. Kenny, "Shakespeare's *Cressida*", *Anglia*, XLIX, 163 et seq.

¹⁷ *Othello*, I, ii, 11.

annulment, that is a legal judgment setting aside the original marriage — a decision such as Henry VIII sought from the Papacy to free himself from Catherine of Aragon.¹⁸ Even an annulment, however, was no simple matter, as Henry VIII himself had learned. *Raptio*¹⁹ was ground for annulment only in the case of "children"²⁰; and the statute of 4 and 5, Philip and Mary, c. 8 applied only to clandestine marriages without parents' consent of "maidens that be inheritors" within the age of sixteen years²¹. Apparently, even this "great, familiar and common mischief"²² had previously gone unpunished. The exact legal age for marriage without parents' consent was a matter of some disagreement in Canon and in secular law: the Church "recognized the age of seven as that when parental consent was no longer necessary", but such marriages were voidable at twelve for females and fourteen for males unless cohabitation had already taken place; and thus "a valid but clandestine marriage might be made merely by sexual intercourse preceded by promises to marry." Such marriages, however, though legal, had both public and ecclesiastical disapproval.²³ Therefore, as Swinburne declares with the citation of much authority, a woman of twelve "may Contract true and lawful Matrimony."²⁴ In fact, the elopement of minors over the ages of twelve and fourteen respectively for the two sexes, was legal in England until the mid-eighteenth century when the statute of 26 George II, c. 33 forbade it.²⁵ In short, the age of seven was necessary in Canon Law and twelve in Common Law to make Desdemona's elopement legal; and surely her management of her father's "house affairs" and her refusal of the "many noble matches" that her father had proposed clearly implies that she was over twelve years old. Brabantio, therefore, had to find other grounds for attacking Othello and declaring the wedlock void.

Canon Law allowed eleven grounds for nullifying marriage²⁶; and most of these obviously do not apply to the case of Othello and Desdemona. The fertile possibility of pre-contract is definitely ruled out by her repeated refusal of suitors whom her father had proposed. Both lovers were baptized Christians. Neither was already married. No problem of consanguinity or physical incapacity was involved; and Brabantio does not even raise the question of consummation. His horrified incredulity turns at once to the eighth ground for annulment, *viz.* that Desdemona had

¹⁸ Powell, *op. cit.*, Appendix A.

¹⁹ F. R. Cougert, *Marriage and Divorce Laws in Europe*, New York, 1893, 7, quotes a Latin verse that mentions *raptio* as a ground for annulment.

²⁰ Cf. Gouge, *op. cit.*, 452.

²¹ D. Pickering, *Statutes at Large*, Cambridge, 1763, VI, 104 *et seq.*

²² *Ibid.*, VI, 104.

²³ Powell, *op. cit.*, 6.

²⁴ Swinburne, *op. cit.*, 47. Cf. Coke on Littleton, Bk. ii, Ch. 4, Secs. 79b and 103-108.

²⁵ See T. Poynter, *Doctrine and Practice of the Ecclesiastical Courts*, Philadelphia, 1836; and Coke, *supra*.

²⁶ See Scott, *cit. supra*.

given no valid consent; and he conducts his case entirely on this basis. He intimates that she had "fear" for Othello, and definitely charges, furthermore, that she was under the influence of drugs and witchcraft and so was, in effect, *non compos*. The abortive trial is conducted along the informal lines that would be possible only when the sovereign himself occupied the bench and not a judicial substitute; and, indeed, Shakespeare, supposing the Doge an autocrat like most of the rulers of petty Italian states, ascribed to him greater power than Venetian custom gave him.

The Doge and Council are so taken up with the Turkish attack on Cyprus and so anxious to consult with Othello that they hardly notice Brabantio when first he enters along with his followers and Othello's; but the outraged father is no sooner greeted than he demands an instant hearing. He charges that his daughter has been "abus'd", and "stol'n" from him "By spells and medicines bought of mountebanks." He threatens to have this "disputed on": perhaps he means that he will hold public debates for the learned on the subject such as Luther challenged when he put up his theses on the church door in Wittenberg; or he may refer to the Venetian custom of having the judges debate the case, as described in Lewkenor's translation of Contareno's *Venice* (1599)²⁷. The Doge is horrified, and promises that Brabantio himself shall give judgment in the case — a promise that he soon evades.

The closely associated charges of using drugs and withcraft to inspire love constituted a serious accusation; for, indeed, these were "Arts inhibited and out of warrant". Not only were the Elizabethans acquainted with the effects of aphrodisiac drugs, or love-philtres²⁸, but Shakespeare had earlier referred to such "medicines"²⁹; and witchcraft also was accepted as a potent agent toward this end³⁰. Since the local "wise woman" would usually compound and dispense such drugs with fitting ceremonies and incantations, the popular mind would naturally associate drugs and witchcraft as almost synonymous elements in the case. Warburton long ago suggested that Shakespeare had in mind a Venetian law against sorcery; but, as Steevens remarked, we have no reason to suppose that Shakespeare knew it³¹; and he was more probably drawing on English background familiar to his audience. At least a century before the Conquest, Anglo-Saxon law had already forbidden the use of potions or spells to win love³²; and, in 1541, the statute of 33 Henry VIII, c. 8 declared it a "felony to practise, or cause to be practised conjuration, witchcraft, enchantment or sorcery ... to provoke any person to unlawful

²⁷ *Othello*, ed. Furness var., 40.

²⁸ J. Ferrand, *Ἐρωτομανία, or a Treatise of Love*, Oxford, 1640, 194 (ed. princ., Paris, 1624); Burton, *Anatomy of Melancholy*, III, 2, 2, 5.

²⁹ *Henry IV, Part I*, II, iii, 18.

³⁰ B. Castiglione, *Courtier*, ed. Everyman, 232.

³¹ *Othello*, ed. Furness var., 48.

³² G. L. Kittredge, *Witchcraft*, Cambridge, Mass., 30.

³³ Pickering, *op. cit.*, V, 79.

love." The first Parliament of Edward VI, however, in a general act repealing criminal legislation of the preceding reign, made this statute void³³. Then in 1562, Elizabeth restored it in even stronger form³⁴; and trials under this charge are recorded in 1582, 1585 and 1591³⁵. After the accession of James I, who was particularly interested in demonology, a new statute was enacted in 1604 just subsequent to the writing of *Othello*³⁶. Brabantio, therefore, takes his stand on legal grounds that were common knowledge at the time.

In the normal course of events, Othello might well have languished in prison for months before the "course of direct session" found time and convenience to call his case; and, even then, the trial and appeals might well have been protracted; but Shakespeare makes appeal impossible by having the sovereign decide in person; and, to ensure the outcome, he has Brabantio himself overstate his case, and then give it away by promising in effect to abide by Desdemona's decision. Thus the plaintiff loses all the advantage that the Doge at first had given him of sentencing the criminal himself. Othello denies the accusations; and Brabantio repeats them; and then the Doge, who has recovered from the shock of the situation, dryly remarks to the angry father that his assertions are "no proof". Brabantio declares that Desdemona's evidence will constitute his proof; she is sent for; she refuses to support his charges; and his case is lost. One cannot imagine a more final or more expeditious settlement; and Shakespeare has cleared the ground for the commencement of the plot.

To accomplish this result, the dramatist took advantage not merely of the laws and the social *mores* of his age, but also of a headlong and short-sighted violence that characterized the noble Senator's prosecution of his case, and made him finally die of grief and shame. Thus the human element of Brabantio's psychology also contributes toward the outcome of the trial and the speed with which it was achieved. He was so angry and so certain of himself that he gave his case away; and this state of mind arose largely from his choleric humor. Choleric was the prevailing bodily and mental temperament of rulers and heads of families³⁷. Brabantio, moreover, is introduced as waking from a dreadful dream; and such dreams were symptomatic of a choleric state.³⁸ The "malicious bravery", moreover, of Iago in the initial scene was particularly calculated to wound the "pride and arrogancie" of the humor³⁹, which were especially "inflamed by contempt"⁴⁰. The choleric type had "strong opinion of

³³ *Ibid.*, VI, 208.

³⁴ Kittredge, *op. cit.*, 108.

³⁵ Pickering, *op. cit.*, VII, 89.

³⁶ C. Dariot, *Judgement of the Starres*, London, 1598, sig. D 3 v. The choleric type under the astral influence of the sun should be distinguished from the soldiers, drunkards and brawlers under the influence of Mars.

³⁷ *Batman upon Bartholome*, London, 1582, leaf 32 v; L. Lemnius, *Touchstone of Complexions*, tr. T. Newton, London, 1581, leaf 131 v.

³⁸ J. Downname, *Spiritual Physicke*, London, 1600, leaf 26 v.

³⁹ N. Coeffeteau, *Table of Humane Passions*, London, 1621, 559.

honour"⁴¹; and Brabantio was outraged at the slur of an elopement on his family prestige. By nature given to "greefe and bitterness"⁴², he becomes utterly distraught, and in his whole future life can foresee "naught but bitterness". The Duke's cold comfort is as nothing to him; and he never recovers.

The mandate of social decency and his own choleric temper left for Brabantio but one recourse: theft and elopement would not stand as charges against his quondam guest; divorce was practically impossible; his choleric acumen suggested sorcery as an indictment, for this at once would nullify the marriage and satisfy his vengeance on Othello; but his very daughter's testimony quashed the charge. He had long loved and trusted her; he had done his duty as a father by supplying eligible suitors; and now she turns upon him twice within an hour. He is a widower, and has no other child. Indeed, he suffers a swifter and more complete calamity even than Lear, whose miseries came somewhat more gradually and who still had one daughter left for comfort. Lear died partly from exposure and extreme old age⁴³; Brabantio purely from mental shock; and, for each, death was the one solution. Had Shakespeare wished to emphasize Brabantio's role, and bring out its tragic possibilities, the first act of *Othello* might have been written as the old man's tragedy, just as *Hamlet* might have been written as the tragedy of Gertrude, or of Polonius, or of Rosencrantz.⁴⁴ Thus a great tragedy brings lesser tragedies to the lesser figures, whose misfortunes we forget, not because they have less potential pathos, but because the dramatist has directed our attention to the main course of events. Brabantio, the choleric aristocrat, chary of honor and headlong in revenge, whose trust in his daughter permitted her to elope and who then ruined his case in court because he could not believe her wilfully undutiful — such a Brabantio not only solves Shakespeare's problem, and gets a swift acquittal for Othello, but also presents in the initial scenes a dignified and tragic character whose fall foreshadows a greater tragedy to come.

West Virginia University.

JOHN W. DRAPER.

⁴¹ T. Adams, *Diseases of the Soule*, London, 1616, 40; P. de la Primaudaye, *French Academy*, London, 1586, 313-314.

⁴² Coeffeteau, 559 *passim*.

⁴³ See the present author, "The Old Age of King Lear", *J. E. G. Ph.*, to appear.

⁴⁴ See the present author, *The "Hamlet" of Shakespeare's Audience*, Durham, N. C., 1938, 125-6, 232-34.

Notes and News

'Pregnant' one. In his study of *The Articles* (reviewed by Professor Bodelsen in *E. S.*, Oct. 1939), Dr. Christophersen enumerates six uses of the numeral *ān* in Old English, the last of which, denoted as "pregnant sense (= 'singular, unique of its kind, without an equal')", he illustrates on p. 99 of his book by two quotations from *Beowulf*:

1458	þæt wæs an foran	ealdgestreona ¹
1885/6	þæt wæs an cyning	
	æghwæs orleahre	

Dr. Christophersen's comment runs: "Sense 6 was probably never very common and was hardly used outside poetry."

I wonder if this statement is quite correct. A reviewer of the book in the January number of the *Modern Language Review* (p. 74) speaks of the first quotation (a description of the sword Hrunting) as "an early instance of the pregnant sense of *an* in Old English", and I can remember coming across an example in OE prose, though I have unfortunately lost the reference. What I chiefly wish to point out, however, is that a similar use of strong-stressed *one* is found in present-day English, especially in American English. If we translate "þæt wæs an cyning" by "he was a king, *if ever there was one*", it seems to me that we can apply the same interpretation to many of the following instances.

- a. 1. "It's one grand and glorious feeling ..."

Dos Passos, *Three Soldiers*, Tauchnitz ed., 259.
[The speaker is Henslowe, an intellectual.]
2. "I got one bird, Bill," said the man, shoving Andrews roughly in the door.

Ib., p. 332. [The speaker is a M(ilitary) P(oliceman).]
3. You made one bad break just now.

S. E. White, *Rules of Game I*. xvii (quoted OED Supplement, s.v. *break* sb. 8e).
4. I've had one hell of a good time in Hollywood, Jack, was what he found to say.

Carl Van Vechten, *Spider Boy*, T., p. 146.
5. As the two little pigs ran towards their brother's brick house, they saw one chance of escaping.

Three Little Pigs, The Bodley Head, p. 42.
- b. 1. It is one evening when every little deb should mind her p's and q's.

Moats, *No Nice Girl Swears*, T., p. 62.
2. All day Gloria had been very morbid ... This was one day Gloria had no reason to be morbid. The crowds had been coming and going all day, since noon the place had been packed, ...

McCoy, *They Shoot Horses, Don't They?*, p. 121.

¹ Dr. Christophersen prints *eald gestreona*. His translation: "that was before a singular old treasure" is emended by a reviewer in the *MLR* (Jan. 1940) to "it was one in the first rank of ancient treasures", "it was an excellent old treasure"; Chr.'s rendering is identical with that in Bosworth-Toller. So is that of the second quotation: "that was a singular king, faultless in everything", where Klaeber translates *æghwæs* by 'in every respect'. — Dr. Chr. prints 1885/6 as if they formed a single verse-line. — Holthausen translates *an* in these lines by 'einzig', 'ausgezeichnet'; Grein (*Sprachschatz*) by 'eximius'. — Neither B.-T. nor Grein give any other examples than those quoted above. The OED omits both the OE and the modern construction.

3. The audience applauded and stamped their feet, begging for thrills, but this was one night they didn't get them.
Ib., p. 160.
- c. 1. [Woman with cancer refuses to take friend's advice to see doctor.]
"You'll die if you don't." Maisie instantly wished the words unsaid.
"Yes, that's what I shall do, and God knows how bad it will be. But no one can do anything, so I'm just going to pray. Ma Godshill once called me 'Godless woman,' at one of her twopenny meetings. Well, she wasn't quite right. This is just one occasion when I do damn well pray."
P. H. Johnson, *This Bed Thy Centre*, p. 228.
2. Ferdinand wasn't a coward. He was just one bull who didn't care about bull-fighting.
Advt. N. Y. Times Book Review, Nov. 15, 1936.
3. "Well, anyhow," decided Kelton. "I can hold him to his promise to-morrow. Before he sets foot off this ship, he'll have to make good his words. Either he's telling the truth, or trying to get away with a brazen bluff. That is at least one question I can leave to time to answer ..."
R. Connell, *Murder at Sea*, p. 174.
4. Ben held up his glass, prolonging anticipation. The fine vatted aroma of the rye cheered his nostrils. Here at least was one trifle which helps assuage the immense tedium of life.
Chr. Morley, *Thunder on the Left*, Penguin ed., p. 141.
5. Here was a man whom he did not have to look down upon to see, one man who could reach above the great logger's boot tops.
James Stephens, *Paul Bunyan*, p. 36.

The grouping of the examples is tentative, but I think it is safe to say that in those under *a* at least *one* expresses the same meaning as in the lines from *Beowulf*. This shades off into 'of all others' in *b* 1 and 2, and then into something like 'exceptional' in *b* 3, and in *c* 1-4, where the sense intended is made more explicit by the addition of 'just', 'at least'. The meaning 'at least' is implicit in *c* 5, which, moreover, provides an instructive example of the difference between *a man* and *one man*.

It should also be observed that in the examples under *a* the construction is 'self-contained', whereas in those under *b* and *c* the group *one* + noun is qualified by a restrictive clause. For that matter, in the second example from *Beowulf* the group is qualified by *æghwæs orleahltre*, and one might perhaps compare it with *c* 5. Such a comparison might even suggest an alternative translation: "he, at least, was a king (who was) altogether blameless."

The construction with a gen. pl. in *Beo.* 1458 is without an exact parallel so far.

It would be interesting to know whether the modern instances of pregnant *one* represent a spontaneous growth, or whether cases can be found linking them up with those from Old English. Americans have always taken pride in pointing to Shakespearian and even Chaucerian survivals ('I guess') in their language; here there would seem to be an opportunity for an earnest researcher to trace its pedigree back to *Beowulf*. We shall be glad to publish the evidence, if any! — Z.

War Words: Last Gleanings. Our repeated thanks are due to Miss A. M. Rekkers, of Flushing, for some further specimens of war words and other neologisms supplementing those assembled in the successive issues of our journal since December 1939.

In connection with the use of *escapist* commented on in our August number the following extracts are illuminating :

It is good to find that the B.B.C. recognises a double duty to its audience in time of war. It gives us bulletins, instructions and exhortations which bring the war home to us a dozen times a day. But it also does its share in taking our minds off the war. I remember in the vanished days of peace a tiresome kind of social reformer who always denounced 'escapist' activities. It was wrong, such fellows said, to take your mind off the business of putting this wicked world to rights; wrong to contemplate a poem or a painting until the New Jerusalem was built.¹ Now that war has come, they, too, will probably discover that only a freak can survive a major operation without the aid of anaesthetics. I heard several 'escapist' items last week, and some of the best in the Schools programmes.

(The Listener, Sept. 21, 1939.)

There are many *semi-escapist* programmes to be heard just now. Items, that is to say, which draw their material from these tragic times, but which lift it to a serener mood. One word about a bare-faced *escapist* item last week — and a most successful one: the parlour game called 'My Aunt Went to Town', in which two teams matched their wit and their memory against each other with an uncommon air of spontaneity.

(*Ibidem*, same article.)

Is it an urge of *escapism*, in the horrid jargon of the day, that leads me to think there has been an unusual spate of talks this week on foreign lands and the English country-side? ... "Bookshelf," by E. C. Bentley ... dealt entirely with books of travel — the sort of travel calculated to satisfy the most pressing *escapism*: clambering for five years in breakneck country, where one at times subsisted on frozen yak's milk, and let down one's donkey over frightful precipices, all four legs tied together; or swimming and diving in ice-cold subterranean rivers with candle and matches, on which one's life depended, done up in a waterproof bathing-cap.

(*Ibidem*, Aug. 17, 1939.)

"Escape" Appeal of the Cinema. Mr. Oliver Bell, the Director of the British Film Institute, answered a question why people go to the cinema in an address to the Psychology section. The most important motive, he said, was "Escape." For many people the entertainment value of the film was secondary to the desire to get away from the humdrum common round for a couple of hours. "This explains the cinema's popularity with housewives who get out of their three-roomed villas and out of themselves."

(Daily Telegraph, Sept. 1, 1939.)

A news-reel cinema provides little "escape" entertainment.

(The Star, Nov. 1, 1939.)

¹ An allusion to William Blake's

I will not cease from mental fight,
Nor shall my sword sleep in my hand,
Till we have built Jerusalem
In England's green and pleasant land.

Blake evidently was no 'escapist'.

In conclusion, a few additional quotations²:

London's amateur policemen (the War Reserves, who have only been full-time policemen for a few weeks) are victims of a new complaint — *gas-mask back*. Standing for eight hours a day with their haversacks slung on their shoulders is making many of them develop stiff backs.
(Evening News, Nov. 10, 1939.)

Captain Euan Wallace, Minister of Transport, studies railway black-out conditions at Paddington and Acton, where he saw the "*ghost trains*"³ which distribute Britain's food supplies in the darkness.
(Ibidem.)

The King and Queen visited underground and "*overground*" shelters. They walked through "*honey-comb*" shelters under a big block of flats.

(Daily Mirror. Sept. 12, 1939.)

I asked Sir Cyril Newall what he thought of the average type of young pilot to-day, especially the '*week-end airman*' as we used to call the Auxiliary.

(The Listener, Nov. 16, 1939.)

Restrictions on Main Lines. *Skeleton Services*: It was also announced by the main line railways that during evacuation, alterations in the existing passenger services would be necessary London Suburban Services: Between 8 a.m. and 5.30 p.m. *skeleton services*⁴ only will operate.
(Daily Telegraph, Sept. 1, 1939.)

The same number of the Daily Telegraph also contains several instances of the word *evacuees* — which takes us back to where we started from a year ago. — Z.

Jespersen's *Modern English Grammar*. Many of our readers will be interested to learn that another volume of Jespersen's *Modern English Grammar* has just appeared. It constitutes Part V (Syntax. Fourth Volume) and deals, among other things, with gerund, infinitive and participle constructions. It is published by Einar Munksgaard, Copenhagen, and the price is 20 Danish crowns. A review will appear in our next number.

² Also, a request to alter the date of the reference for *crashproof* (Aug. number, p. 140, l. 18-19) from Feb. 10 to 17.

³ The words probably imply an allusion to a play of the thriller variety popular some twelve years ago.

⁴ OED Supplement gives *skeleton staff*: 'of the minimum size for carrying on the work to be done.' (Quot. 1925.)

Reviews

The Life and Work of William Gilpin (1724-1804), Master of the Picturesque and Vicar of Boldre. By WILLIAM D. TEMPLEMAN. (Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, Vol. xxiv). 336 pp. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1939. \$3.00 (paper-bound); \$3.00 (cloth-bound).

William Gilpin is not a well known figure to the student of English. Nine out of ten, indeed, have probably never heard of him. He had, it is true, a contemporary reputation, and at one time he attracted considerable attention from those engaged in the study of aesthetics, but even in that capacity he has, during the last half-century, receded somewhat into the background, and it has been left to Dr. Templeman to rescue him from oblivion. He has done it with thoroughness, patience and perseverance. His thoroughness, indeed, is almost overwhelming; so much so that one occasionally feels that he is in danger of missing the wood for the trees and of attaching a significance to Gilpin out of all proportion to his real importance. It is a danger that besets all research students who seek to rehabilitate a minor figure of a past age, and Dr. Templeman has not always managed to steer clear of the danger. Lists of authorities, of reprints, of translations, of eulogies by contemporary critics, of writers upon whom one's subject seems to have exercised an influence can look very imposing; but how much are they worth? How far do they reflect his real significance and importance? These are the questions one feels inclined to ask in the case of William Gilpin.

The title of Dr. Templeman's book indicates fairly accurately the dual capacity in which Gilpin is considered. It was as master of the picturesque that he was best known in his own age and for a generation after, and it is therefore only to be expected that our author should devote considerable space to this aspect of his fame. But to the present reviewer it has seemed that the chief fact that Dr. Templeman reveals is that this side of Gilpin's achievement, historically significant though it may be, is second to the work he accomplished in other spheres, notably as a schoolmaster and as Vicar of Boldre, a small parish in Hampshire.

Dr. Templeman has gone into Gilpin's life in some detail. Descended of a cultured and illustrious ancestry, he was born in 1724. His first few years were passed in a home where good music and painting were appreciated, where religion (though not narrow sectarianism) was fostered, and where he was taught the duty of all Christians to be cheerful, kind and charitable. He received his schooling at Carlisle, St. Bee's and then at Queen's College, Oxford, where he graduated B.A. in 1744 and M.A. in 1748. In 1746 he was ordained, and five years later went to teach at Cheam School first as assistant and later as headmaster. Meanwhile he had married and started upon a literary career with a biography of his ancestor, Bernard Gilpin, which was followed by other biographies, in all

of which he sought not only to record facts but also to illustrate and illumine character. With his *Essay Upon Prints* (1768), in which he first gave to the word "picturesque" its modern sense, he became accepted as an authority upon print-collecting, and later essays on the same and allied subjects enhanced his reputation. He accepted the living of Boldre in 1777 and discharged his duties conscientiously until his death in 1804. This, briefly, is the outline of his life as given by Dr. Templeman. It can be taken as accurate and authoritative, for the author has gone to great pains to verify all his details and has been able to correct a number of mis-statements which appeared in earlier accounts.

When he comes to Gilpin's work and achievement it is as a writer on aesthetics, and particularly on the picturesque, that he considers him first, probably because, as we have said, it was in this capacity that he was best known in his own day. One cannot but feel, however, that too much space is devoted to the subject. A somewhat lengthy chapter on the history of the word "picturesque" in eighteenth century criticism goes into unnecessary detail, and at a later stage there is an unduly minute treatment of Gilpin's influence upon later writers. On the other hand the section which deals with the actual theory of the picturesque must be highly commended. Here Dr. Templeman has handled a difficult subject with great skill, for Gilpin's statement of his views was not always marked by clarity, while sometimes the views themselves lack conciseness and sometimes they are not fully developed. Dr. Templeman's elaboration of them, together with his apt illustrations, has clarified them considerably; and he has brought out with particular force Gilpin's distinction between *beauty* and *picturesque*: smoothness, regularity, balance, symmetry make for beauty; the rough, the rugged, the quaint produce the quality implied in the term "picturesque". Might one say that the difference between the beautiful and the picturesque is the difference between classic and romantic? Dr. Templeman does not raise the question, but it seems worth consideration. Incidentally the answer to it might throw another sidelight upon the Romantic Revival of the eighteenth century.

It frequently happens that what a person's own generation deems important about him, in the long run turns out to be comparatively unimportant, while what it overlooks or fails to estimate at its true value becomes for later ages the really significant fact. This seems to have been the case with Gilpin. What he contributed to aesthetics is inconsiderable beside what he accomplished as an educationist and a social worker¹, in both of which fields he was a pioneer who anticipated certain reformers who have become much better known than he. At Cheam he instituted a system of self-government amongst his scholars, and came near to establishing the prefect system, which later was to become a recognised part of all English public and secondary schools, and remains so to this day. He did away with many of the evils of fagging, he abolished corporal

¹ This is the present reviewer's opinion, not necessarily that of Dr. Templeman.

punishment for all but very serious offences, he sought to appeal to the honour and better nature of his pupils, and, as well as he was able, approached the question of discipline from a psychological standpoint. Games (especially cricket) formed an important part of his curriculum; so did gardening. He instituted a school tuck-shop (an adjunct of most modern schools) and he compiled a modernised version of the New Testament for school use. At Boldre he anticipated Robert Raikes by establishing a Sunday School, he founded day schools for the children of the poor, and he even tried to cope with the problem of feeding and clothing necessitous scholars. Here, clearly, was an educational pioneer, though he has found no mention in most of the standard text books which deal with the development of the English educational system.

Dr. Templeman's book, as we have said, shows careful and painstaking research and a very close knowledge of the period with which it deals. The author has read very widely, and his work is well documented. He has treated his subject carefully, even exhaustively, so that no-one will, in all probability, ever wish to supersede what he has written. We do feel, however, that he has got his figure a little out of perspective and, on the literary side particularly, tends to make him appear more important than he really was.

Sheffield.

FREDERICK T. WOOD.

Fenimore Cooper. Sa Vie et son Œuvre. La Jeunesse (1789-1826). Par MARCEL CLAVEL. 695 + (3) pp. 8°. Imprimerie universitaire de Provence. E. Fourcine. Aix-en-Provence. 1938. (Thèse de la faculté des lettres Aix-Marseille.)

Fenimore Cooper and his Critics. American, British and French Criticisms of the Novelist's Early Work. By MARCEL CLAVEL. 418 pp. 8°. Imprimerie universitaire de Provence. E. Fourcine. Aix-en-Provence. 1938. (Thèse complémentaire de la faculté des lettres Aix-Marseille.)

More than six hundred large pages on the beginnings of Cooper till his departure for Europe in 1826 assuredly is a labour of love and no book has been written on the American novelist with the sympathy and the warmth of heart that M. Clavel shows for his subject. And none with the fullness of detail both as to fact and discussion that the present author offers. He has not only gone through all the printed material in existence, especially the large body of criticism published in American, English and French periodicals and books from the day of Cooper's first appearance down to the printing of this thesis, but he has also made use of researches

in various public archives such as those of the Burlington County Historical Society, the State Department in Washington, Yale University, the British Museum, etc., and above all he has had access to the MSS formerly in the possession of the Fenimore-Cooper family and now removed to Yale University and so long jealously guarded from publication in obedience to the wish of the novelist expressed in the bitterness of his last years that no biography of himself should be published. These family archives, to be sure, had already been drawn upon by Cooper's own daughter Susan (S.F.C.) and by his grandson James for most of the intimate facts of Cooper's life at our present disposal, but there still must be a great deal left that has not yet been disclosed. This, however, obviously does not cover Cooper's early life to any great extent, — that is true of most personal archives — since M. Clavel has only a few new facts and those of no very great importance to impart from this source. The revelations must come in his discussion of the second half of the novelist's career.

From the materials at his disposal he has created a panorama of Cooper's early years. Against the family tradition he gives him a purely English ancestry, discounting the Scandinavian, Dutch and French strains rather proudly assumed by Cooper himself. For the Fenimores seem to have been of English stock. Judge William Cooper's early life and especially the circumstances of his great land speculation on the frontier of central New York State are treated with a satisfying fullness and incidentally the conception of the novelist's father as a grand seigneur living on a vast feudal estate in the wilderness is exploded. But his sociability, the richness of his board and the unbounded extent of his hospitality are duly stressed and illustrated. The childhood environment of the son is reconstructed with a wealth of details drawn from the novels, producing a picture in which the Indians are conspicuously absent. Cooperstown lay, by the time young Cooper was old enough to take note, well within the borders of civilization, even though a very rough one, and the novelist confesses that he never was among the Indians and gathered all he knew of them from books and from what his father, who saw a great deal of them in the Western part of the State, told him. The boy's education is traced from its first beginnings at his sister's knee, she being eleven years his senior, through a short period spent at the Cooperstown academy and in the printing office of the local newspaper, where Cooper attempted his first novel on the model of a chap-book version of *Don Belianis of Greece* — M. Clavel cannot produce the original, but tries to give us a taste of its probable quality by quoting from one of the popular chap-book versions of the day — to the high Tory household of the Rev. Thomas Ellison at Albany, from which he finally proceeded to Yale College. His tutoring had been so good that he could afford to waste his time in pranks which caused his expulsion from College in his third year of residence.

Cooper's decision to try for the navy is brought by M. Clavel in connection with the general political situation of the day and the law of 1806 enabling the President to enlarge the officers' corps of the service,

thus offering Cooper a gentleman's career more to his taste. In the absence of a Naval Academy the usual training was obtained as a common sea-man in a merchant vessel, and Cooper naturally adopted this course, thus gaining his first experience of the sea, the British tyranny of it and several European countries he visited. M. Clavel suggests that Cooper had already been at sea before, i.e. in the interval between leaving college in the summer of 1805 and sailing on the *Sterling* in October 1806; but there is no conclusive proof of this. His actual service in the Navy was disappointing — is so even to us, since he saw practically no service on the high seas and was employed chiefly on Lake Ontario in building a war-vessel for the defence of the frontier against Canada. The policy of the American government against British aggression on the high seas was chiefly one of "appeasement" and offered a spirited young man of independent means very little inducement to continue in the service. The sudden death of his father and his engagement to a young lady of the New York aristocracy may have been merely the occasion of Cooper's withdrawal from the Navy, at first on a prolonged leave of absence, then with a final resignation. Cooper's thoughts during the War of 1812, when the navy he had just left was fighting its first great battles, M. Clavel can only surmise, and the retreat from Westchester County and the proximity of the sea and the port of New York to the vicinity of Cooperstown in the backwoods of the Continent may have been indicative of a restlessness that had to be suppressed.

Except for a part-owner's interest in a whaler on which he occasionally sailed himself, Cooper was now a gentleman-farmer and M. Clavel describes these years spent partly at Cooperstown, partly in Westchester County with the understanding sympathy of the Provençal. We hear a great deal of agricultural activities during the day and of chess-playing in the evening, but very little of literary activity beyond novel-reading on the part of the world-famed writer Cooper was to be a few years hence. He was interested in amateur theatricals, was a good hand at throwing off occasional poetry in the popular ballad style and has the boyish *Don Belianis* to his credit, but he had no connection with the young American school of literature started by Irving, Paulding and others while he was in New York and seems to have had only an amateur's interest in higher literature. Even M. Clavel's detailed account cannot banish the conception now prevalent of Cooper as essentially a man of action and not a "poet" in any deep sense of the word. Hence his sudden emergence as a novelist remains the surprise and the mystery it has always been and calls for a deeper insight into his mind and character than M. Clavel's epic can give.

Precaution begins the long series of Cooper's novels and the new task, that of literary interpretation, that M. Clavel has to set himself. In this first of his critical chapters he has, on the whole, given his best work, for he succeeds in persuading the reader that the artistic model set by Maria Edgeworth and Jane Austen was well worth imitating and that Cooper, after all, not only did his job with a good deal of gusto, but made

a very respectable success of it. The sympathetic and minute analysis of the work shows the essentially practical basis of Cooper's talent, the admonitory trend of the story and the eye for character and conduct the author had. Among the possible reasons for Cooper's success in capturing the peculiarities of English social life M. Clavel forgets the principal one, namely his knowledge of the English social novel of the day. In *The Spy* M. Clavel notes the same faculty of the born story-teller in manipulating a large group of personages, and vindicates Cooper's realism as a creator of character. That he was the first to depict the Negro in fiction is a discovery that M. Clavel takes over from J. H. Nelson, while the story published very much later (in 1860) as a true one which shows us Washington in a situation very much like the one created by Cooper in *The Spy* seems to be his own find. Cooper's imitation of Scott is taken for granted, naturally; but in a work that spends so much space on a detailed summary of the contents and the characters of the novel, one might expect a sharper analysis of both Scott's technique and Cooper's adaptation of it. Cooper claimed much more originality than we are inclined to give him credit for; how much truth is there in Cooper's claim? And M. Clavel makes not even passing mention of Cooper's predecessors in the fictional treatment of American historical material. *The Pioneers*, which, as M. Clavel rightly observes, was obviously written with more abandon than the previous books, raises the problems of Leatherstocking and the Indians. M. Clavel is inclined to deprecate the influence of Daniel Boone as a model and decides in favour of Nathaniel Shipman as against David, making some pertinent remarks on the changes the figure of Leatherstocking went through in the course of time, especially the greater realism of speech in the stories written last. In the portraiture of the "good" Indian M. Clavel sees a tradition that goes as far back as Roger Williams and Cadwallader Colden and appears in Freneau's poems, Southey's *Gertrude of Wyoming*, an essay of Irving's, etc.

The Pilot opened up a new vein not only in Cooper's work but in the literature of the world. M. Clavel points to various maritime elements in the previous novels as indicating a gradual approach toward the sea-story proper, and finds Cooper's predecessors in the latter not so much in the prose of such writers as Smollett as in the sea-poetry of Falconer (*The Shipwreck*) and Freneau. Actually, however, there appeared, while Cooper was at work on *The Pilot*, a naval story called *The Man-of-War's Man* and signed S., the author otherwise calling himself Bill Truck, in Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine, which Cooper may or may not have seen. This tale M. Clavel treats at length, while he gives hardly more than a passing mention to John Davis's sea-story *The Post-Captain*, which had appeared in 1805, was very popular and can hardly have escaped Cooper's notice. The fact that Davis devotes only 18 out of a total of 46 chapters to the sea by no means rules the book out, since Cooper himself did not yet dare to leave the action of his own novel entirely on the sea and actually has approximately the same ratio. The very inadequacy of

Davis's work would have been an incentive to Cooper to do something better. *Lionel Lincoln* fares no better at M. Clavel's friendly hands than heretofore under more rigorous critics. The purely historical portions are highly praised, but the penny-dreadful plot is justly censured and the peculiar point of view adopted by Cooper, the selection of an enemy of the Revolution as the hero of his treatment of the first and most popular phase of the Revolution, however interesting it might be in itself, is rightly regarded as the fundamental weakness of the book, for which M. Clavel, in his enthusiasm for his subject, offers an alternative plot which might have saved the situation. Unfortunately his suggestion comes too late. *The Last of the Mohicans* completed the step begun by *The Pioneers* and took the centre of interest beyond the White Man's frontier into the heart of the Indian country, making Indians the heroes of the tale. In this respect the book is another new departure on Cooper's part, supported, as M. Clavel points out, by the *North American Review*, which since its beginning had been calling for stories on the rich Indian material. The exact extent of Cooper's realism in depicting Indian life and character M. Clavel does not attempt to decide; Cooper's personal experience of Indians was extremely meagre and he got most of his material and his general point of view from Heckewelder's book on the Pennsylvania Indians. Some customs not traceable to a source may be his invention, but the final result is such that his Indians, at first accepted with enthusiasm, then viewed with suspicious criticism, are even now the subject of a more or less lively debate pro and con among specialists. Under the circumstances, certainly a high achievement!

The chief value of M. Clavel's study lies in the warmth of his enthusiasm for his author, an enthusiasm which places the right accent on Cooper's nature descriptions, follows patiently the intricacies of his plots without succumbing to the modern aversion to too much construction, accepts his characters for what they are intended to be as much as for what they are, places his stilted style and especially his dialogue in the true perspective of his time and finds the charitable excuse for his hastiness and carelessness and general lack of artistic conscience. Much in M. Clavel's point of view is supported by the criticism of Cooper's own day, which has been assembled and commented upon in the supplementary thesis, and in general one may say that his presentation of the case is a more just one than that of Lounsbury, whom he avowedly wishes to supplant.

Basel.

H. LÜDEKE.

Hermann Melville, Eine Stilistische Untersuchung. Von WALTER WEBER. XVIII + 242 pp. Inaugural-Dissertation Basel. Basel: Philographischer Verlag. 1937.

Hermann Melvilles Gedankengut, Eine kritische Untersuchung seiner weltanschaulichen Grundideen. Von Dr. K. H. SUNDERMANN. 226 pp. Berlin: Verlag Arthur Collignon. 1937.

These two doctoral theses come in the wake of the general re-valuation of Melville which has been setting in since August 1, 1919, the hundredth anniversary of his birth. Dr. Weber's heavily documented stylistic analysis purports to help towards an objective valuation 'unbiassed by national feelings'. For he labours under the impression that whereas his own countrymen praise him as one of their greatest authors and thinkers, 'M. ist für die Engländer kaum mehr als der literarische Entdecker der Südsee.' One wonders from what source Dr. Weber got such information, which seems at best some 20 years behind the times. Barrie confessedly owed his Captain Hook to Melville; in Masfield's opinion *Moby Dick* 'speaks the whole secret of the sea'. V. Meynell called him 'one of the greatest of all imaginative writers' as far back as 1920, and H. M. Tomlinson wrote: 'Miss M. is right when she calls *Moby Dick* the crown of one's reading life. There is no other book like *Moby Dick*'. In 1923 D. H. Lawrence published his penetrating article on Melville in his *Studies in Classic Amer. Lit.*. The *Times Lit. S.* introduced Freeman's biography as seeking to fulfil a crying need, being the first English book on 'perhaps the most astonishing literary figure of the last century' (20.5.1926). In 1927 E. M. Forster ranked Melville among the four great 'prophets', alongside of Dostoevsky, D. H. Lawrence and E. Brontë (*Aspects of the Novel*). I must stop at that. Did all these comparatively early comments of outstanding British writers escape Dr. Weber's attention?

Like Blake's Demiurgos, the author sets his compasses to Melville's life-work, and *Moby Dick* in particular, investigating his 'Belesenheit', analysing his rhythms and onomatopoeia, his 'Wortkunst' and rhetorical devices, tropes, metaphors, and symbolism, and keeping exact count of the percentage of principal (18 %) and dependent (82 %) clauses in *Moby Dick*. The latter work out at 32 % of attributive clauses in the strict sense, or 52 % respectively in a wider sense, including modal and other clauses + 20 % of 'logical' clauses, leaving a remainder of 10 % of 'dispositional' ones to which, however, a 'central importance' is attributed. Dr. W. sees in them proof of Melville's 'conscious adhesion to a fundamentally epic structure', in 'direct opposition to De Quincey' (who on p. 35 incidentally was said to have exercised a decisive influence on him). As the chief result of the above count, however, Dr. W. announces that 'ein ähnliches Verhältnis zwischen assoziativem (attributivem) und logischem Denken, beide in so ausgedehntem Masse, dürften wir nicht so bald wieder bei einem Prosaschriftsteller finden'. But a glance at the schedule of counts to which he

has subjected 7 additional writers reveals that at least two (Defoe and Sterne) come up to the same mark, if they are not better off in this respect. Accordingly we are told (p. 86) that Sterne's influence was decisive ('in erster Linie sich an St. schulend'). The comparative count further reveals Melville's 'close relationship' to De Quincey (see above) and Hawthorne (in the attributive element), and to Carlyle (in the logical element). No wonder that Dr. W. admits that 'these figures have only a relative importance'.

Dr. Weber consistently tries to find out potential models on which Melville moulded his style. There is a round dozen of separate chapters entitled '*Literarische Abhängigkeit*', in which he stands over M. trying to pin him down to some one model. And his choice is a difficult one indeed, since one influence seems to be continually offsetting the other. So he inclines now to this writer now to that, oscillating chiefly between the Elizabethans and the above mentioned 7 writers. Again he is forced to admit that 'M. hat alle grossen Erscheinungen der englischen Literatur in sich aufgenommen' (p. 195). He is particularly intent on proving some discipleship to Carlyle in the teeth of heavy odds, for C. is a typical representative of pictorial as opposed to rhythmical prose, of which M. is shown to be an outstanding protagonist. What he says about this dependence is hardly convincing. He is obviously disappointed at not being able to include Blake among the models. We can only say that M. emerges from this painful scrutiny much as Gulliver did from the thousand and one strings with which the Liliputians tried to pin him down. In his summing up Dr. Weber feels himself constrained to warn his readers against the impression that he wished to represent Melville as a mere mosaic of alien influences, devoid of any originality, and he continues with a very sound piece of reasoning: 'muss nicht alles, was Einfluss üben kann, schon irgendwie potentiell im Dichter vorhanden sein?' We might add the words of Freeman (which incidentally show up the futility of all source-hunting): 'it need not be suggested — for that would be foolish — that Melville wrought consciously to effect all that analysis might reveal This is the character of genius, that what is unconscious and infinite intercepts the hand of the conscious...'

A particular weakness seems to adhere to the author's treatment of Melville's diction. To begin with, he only knows one work on the English language in America (Krapp). It is not surprising, then, that he finds 'hardly any colloquial Americanisms' in Melville. Dr. Weber does not 'recognize an Americanism when he sees one', or he would have included, e.g., stump-speech (which occurs in another connexion on p. 45), corn-cob, bluff, I guess, it's broke, I seed her, wonderfulest, that 'ere bed, are you through?, the typical use of 'some', baggage, an almighty big bed, I vum (= vow), he likes 'em (steaks) rare (= underdone), from out me, the whole that razeed me, etc., to mention only a few examples culled at random from the pages of *Moby Dick*. The fault may lie partly with the British text (J. Cape) he has used, which may have retained the bowdlerizations

of the earlier British edition of which Mr. Ament complains in a short article in *American Speech* (VII, 365 ff., 1932): 'in chapter XVI of *Moby Dick* alone there are 106 variations in the details of composition; among those details are several which are changed because certain American usages were not approved in England'. One interesting linguistic find at any rate has been let slip: the adj. *care-free* which seems to have originated in the U.S. and is now so much in vogue in Britain occurs in *Moby Dick* (ch. XXXIV) and elsewhere. Thus we can carry back the first recorded entry of the word by three years, since both the *NED. Suppl.* and the *Dictionary of American English* give 1854 as the date of the earliest recorded use. (Had Dr. W. known it was not recorded by NED. he would certainly have claimed it as a Melvillian coinage). I should hardly think of including such words as 'emetic, hydrophobia, obstetrics, aerated, or plaintiff' (!) as proof that Melville attempted to 'give a scholarly background to his novels', nor should I single out expressions like 'Benthamites, Feejeeans, Hittite, Armageddon, Juggernaut' or 'Parcae' as 'geographical and historical curiosities no longer intelligible to-day'. Is 'groundswell' a Melvillian coinage or, for the matter of that, 'air-eddy'? Is it permissible to single out as typically Melvillian compounds such words as 'sickle-shaped, weather-stained, stormtossed, ready-manned' etc. or, of all things, such as 'poverty-stricken, bowie-knives, sea-going, dark-looking, dark-complexioned, broad-brimmed (hat), over-ruling, pitch-like, greenish-white, unostentatious, semi-intelligent, bedraggled, omniscient'? Far from proving the virtuoso Melville's 'Wortbildungskraft' their inclusion only betrays a lack of 'Sprachgefühl' on the part of the author. Why not select such compounds as 'overswarm' (tr. v.) or 'earthsmen', etc., to say nothing of constructions unrecorded by the NED. as 'to stand the mast-head'?

Since Dr. W. avowedly set out on the ambitious plan of laying the sure foundations for an objective assessment of such an elusive personality as Melville it is as well to point out that he has not got much beyond his predecessors, whose 'valuable hints' he professes to have used with 'critical reserve'. But it is obvious that the author has taken immense pains over a labour of love, and it must be clearly stated that as far as a doctoral thesis goes he has acquitted himself extremely well of a difficult task.

The same can be said of Dr. Sundermann's thesis, which reveals both an identically painstaking and conscientious method and similar shortcomings. The author is quite positive ('ganz eindeutig steht fest') that Melville 'wished to be appraised also as a thinker' (p. 5). So he is at pains to lay bare his 'weltanschauliche Grundideen'. With a considerable wealth of detail he deals critically with Melville's religious, philosophical and artistic views 'in ihren Hauptlinien', and somewhat more perfunctorily with his historical and social views, purposing to throw more light thereby on the inner life and thought of M. But he prejudges the issue by a repeatedly expressed opinion, not to say obsession, that M. was far more concerned with his philosophical outlook than with literary expression: 'die äussere Form

ist zwar wichtig, aber der innere Gehalt, kurz die bekundete Weltanschauung ist viel wichtiger' (p. 129; cf. also pp. 122-3). What then are these Melvillian 'Grundanschauungen', and his 'Grundthema'? A dualistic contrast between 'this world and the next', between 'the ideal and reality'. In the eternal fight between good and evil M. saw 'the ruling world principle'. To him Evil was eternal like God, 'etwas Durchaus-für-sich-Seiendes'. A pessimism sapping his vital energies was his besetting sin; in this the 'New England conscience' reasserted itself. This pessimism for which, according to Dr. S., Melville's repeated failures in life were only partly responsible, was acquired chiefly under the spell of such books as the Old Testament (which exercised a 'baneful influence' on him), or Dante and Hamlet. Dr. S. arrives at these and many more conclusions by throwing into the melting-pot the whole of Melville's work including his letters and diaries, as well as the comments of other people on M. But in trying to get down to bed-rock Dr. S. often comes up against some hard facts in view of which he is at last forced to confess that his cannot be a final assessment. He seems to be a little shy of having to draw to such an extent upon *Clarel* ('es birgt grosse Schätze M.schen Gedanken-gutes aus der Spätzeit seines Schaffens'), to which he devotes a detailed analysis, although he admits its 'unleugbare künstlerische Unzulänglichkeit'. On the other hand the reader is put off with respect to *Billy Budd* because 'die seelische Motivierung harrt noch der Auswertung'. He is seriously puzzled by many contradictory statements, which 'it is not always possible to resolve into harmony': although Melville's besetting sin is his pessimism, he has not 'unconditionally abandoned himself to it; he was oscillating from time to time in his belief in men and things and this struggle, so typical of Melville in the prime of his creative period often precludes us from putting the right construction upon his views'. We might add: is it not M. who exclaimed in *Mardi*: 'I have loved ships, as I have *loved men*'? Besides his 'cult of the mysterious' accounts for many 'weltanschauliche Lücken', which we have great difficulties in filling up, etc. Now if M. valued 'weltanschaulichen Gehalt' more than anything else, the reader is tempted to ask how he could hold such views as those on 'unbewusstes Schaffen', or be convinced that his work was 'predestinated'? And how are we to reconcile with that M's own statement that the theme of his magnum opus was not spiritual but realistic? (see his newly discovered letter to Mrs. Hawthorne). Dr. S. is also puzzled at the fact that M. refuses to be reduced to some sweeping formula, and that he cannot find a common denominator for that dreamer and mystic, romantic and transcendentalist, who suddenly changes into a realist and Puritan, a sailor and practical man. (He hazards the label 'universaler Eklektiker'). Dr. S. further admits his inability to arrive at any completeness or assurance in tracing Melville's borrowings ('gedankliche Entlehnungen'). 'Welche Quellen ihm am nächsten gelegen haben' (Fate vs. Free will) 'lässt sich, wie öfters bei ihm, nicht mit absoluter Gewissheit sagen' (p. 98). As chief influences he mentions Plato, Emerson, Sir Th. Browne, Carlyle. But an unambiguous proof of M. borrowing either

from Plato or Emerson can only be given in a few cases; besides, there was a kind of 'Geistesverwandtschaft' between Sir Th. Browne and M. In view of these admissions it is strange to see how readily Dr. S. adopts the views of Van Wyck Brooks concerning Melville's dependence on Carlyle. He is positive ('unleugbar' seems a favourite with him) that M. must have read *Sartor Resartus* ('die vielen Anklänge und Entlehnungen können unmöglich ein Zufall sein'). But he gives not a single convincing proof of that dependence. What about their mutual 'Scottish heritage', or some indirect influence (through Emerson) as in the case of Plato? Incidentally Dr. S. is as positive about M.'s dependence on Byron and Blake. We may again point out that it seems quite natural that the transcendentalists were wide readers and assimilated many thoughts from the most diverse sources. But it would be difficult indeed to put one's finger on one particular source in a given case.

'We are denied an insight into the essence of Melville's creative work' Dr. S. states resignedly (p. 120). This brings us back to what Mr. E. M. Forster said in 1927: '... words.. do not carry us much further.. perhaps they carry us backwards, for they may mislead us into harmonizing the incidents ... The essential in *Moby Dick* ... lies outside words ... *Moby Dick* is full of meanings: its meaning is a different problem ... Melville reaches ... straight back into the universal'.

Jena.

G. KIRCHNER.

Doughty's English. By WALT TAYLOR. (S.P.E. Tract No. LI). 64 pp. Oxford, At the Clarendon Press. 1939. 2s. 6d. net.

The tradition of Charles Doughty's family was of service in the navy. Being refused for the navy on account of a slight impediment in his speech Doughty decided to serve his country in the field of Letters. He felt great contempt for the decadence of the English language in the Victorian age, and deemed it a patriotic duty to show his contemporaries that English was capable of regeneration. *Arabia Deserta*, in fact, was primarily meant as a sort of literary exercise¹, an experiment in regenerate English, later to be followed by work of greater ambition. As occasionally happens, however, the experimental work has come to be linked for ever with the name of its creator. Whereas not many of those who have read (possibly only fragments of) *Arabia Deserta* could probably tell offhand the names of the long epic poems which Doughty himself considered his most important literary achievement.

¹ "A principal cause of writing (*Arabia Deserta*) was, besides the interest of the Semitic life in tents, my dislike of Victorian English; and I wished to show, and thought I might be able to show, that there was something else." (In a letter to D. G. Hogarth, quoted by Treneer, p. 26.)

The value of Doughty's literary output has been adequately dealt with in some critical treatises, the best of which are Professor Barker Fairley's and Miss Anne Treneer's monographs. In the present S.P.E. tract Mr. Taylor has done a piece of systematic research into the differences between Doughty's English and Standard English. Naturally Mr. Taylor, writing for the S.P.E., is more or less expected to praise one Doughtyism as a "needed" or "useful" addition to the English language, and to condemn another as a "mannerism", although in the case of Doughty's English this sort of criticism hardly serves a useful purpose, as it seems extremely doubtful whether any of his "innovations" will ever pass into Standard English, either in colloquial or literary usage.

To every reader of Doughty Mr. Taylor's tract will be a welcome guide through the trees of the, in not infrequent patches dim, forest of Doughty's diction. Doughty formed his English, partly upon Older English (Old English, the language of Chaucer, Spenser and the Bible), and partly upon the pattern of Arabic. What Doughty admired in Arabic was its purity, the deliberateness with which each word is chosen, and what Taylor calls the "elemental" character of the language, i.e. its eminent faculty for expressing "fundamentals, things that exist, and deep-seated emotions". Doughty sought to create an English that would be as expressive as Arabic, and expressive of the same fundamentals. In his attempt to write "elemental" English, Doughty is chiefly found to rely on: 1. the usage of words in a sense which might be justified by their etymology (e.g. "ingenuous" for "freeborn", "journey" for "day's journey"); 2. the looser Germanic syntax in preference to the more formal Latin syntax of English; 3. the use of words with emotional associations; 4. the power of the individual word: "Doughty's thought was conceived and expressed not as the paragraph in prose and the stanza in verse, nor as the sentence which is a unit in itself, but as a sequence of carefully chosen and placed but separate words". (Taylor, p. 11). We are not surprised, though we may regret, that Mr. Taylor's study of Doughty's English is practically confined to a study of Doughty's idiom.

Mr. Taylor has found that only seven of the words coined by Doughty or used by him in an unusual sense have found their way into the O.E.D., while three hundred more are not recorded there. Of these Mr. Taylor instances among the "needed" words: "bathier" for "An attendant of the bath", "musicant" meaning "both singer and player on a musical instrument", and "richard" ironically used for "a rich man". Doughty used a surprising number of compounds (Mr. Taylor taking exception to his inconsistency in the use of hyphens), chiefly to express a concept for which there is a word in Arabic but not in English (e.g. circlet-band, dye-beard, the numerous compounds with coffee-, etc.); he also revives many Old English compounds, though words like "footgoer, house-peace,

² Mr. Taylor often uses grammatical terms in a very loose sense. No instance is provided of Doughty's preference of Germanic "syntax"; probably word-order is meant

tree-kind, world-wise, land-inward, miles-long" seem to indicate that Doughty's knowledge of the Dutch language influenced his vocabulary to a greater extent than Mr. Taylor suggests.

Words directly introduced from Arabic are very freely and inconsistently transliterated, and very remarkable is the freedom with which Doughty applied the English systems of declension and conjugation to Arabic words. So "seyl" (from "sala", "to flow"; Ar. plural "suyul") in Doughty has an English plural "seyls", and is even used as a verb "to seyl", with both the participial ending -ing and the participial and tense ending -ed. Rarely does Doughty use an Arabic word when an English word will do as well; he sometimes even prefers an English word to an Arabic, though the Arabic word may have become completely naturalized, as when he uses "elder" or "patrician" for "sheykh".

Among native English sources from which Doughty drew, apart from Chaucer and Spenser (Mr. Taylor has listed nearly 200 Chaucerian and Spenserian words, from *Arabia Deserta* and the poems), are various dialects (not only Doughty's native Suffolk, but also Northern dialects and Scottish). Other obsolete words included by Doughty in his enormous thesaurus were from the Bible (Tyndale's translation), from Wycliff, Elyott, Skelton, the Authorized Version and the Elizabethan dramatists. A little surprising at first sight, but quite natural considering Doughty's passion for the right word in every case, is the use of some daring colloquialisms (Doughty was probably the first English writer to use the American colloquialism "fresh" in the sense of "forward, impertinent").

After a few brief notes on other Arabic influences on Doughty's English (Old English "eme" is chosen in preference to "uncle", because it echoes the sound of Arabic "amm"), and on spelling and punctuation, Mr. Taylor devotes not quite five pages to a discussion of Doughty's "grammar". This is the least satisfactory part of his treatise. Is it really important that Doughty is inconsistent in his use of "a" and "an" before nouns beginning with the sounds [h] and [ju]? I cannot agree with Mr. Taylor that Doughty should be erratic in his use of "one", nor that "one" is used almost as an equivalent of French "on" in "so one fired a pistol at his bosom" (*Ar. Des.* i, 258). Is it worth mentioning that Doughty uses "whose" as the genitive form of the relative pronoun for things? Not everyone will think it a mannerism in Doughty to begin with an adjective in a sentence like: "Wide are the antique burying grounds." Is it indeed a preposition that is hyphenated to a verb in: "the master caravanners ride-in after the emir to take their menzils (*Ar. Des.* ii. 469)"? A few striking characteristics of Doughty's syntax (e.g. his frequent use of "to be" as an auxiliary of tense) are completely overlooked. Mr. Taylor's remarks on Doughty's grammar will satisfy few grammarians.

Of Doughty's sentence structure Mr. Taylor observes that "here (he) shows most clearly that he is basing himself on Arabic style". In vain do we look for an example substantiating this undoubtedly true assertion.

An analysis of Doughty's sentence structure would certainly be of great linguistic interest.

I will not conclude this review on a note of disparagement, however. On the whole Mr. Taylor's tract is a work of scholarship, and for those who wish to obtain a deeper insight into Doughty's idiomatic usage, it will be an invaluable help. There is a very good index, which makes it possible to use the book as a Doughty dictionary.

Groningen.

M. H. BRAAKSMA.

Proceedings of the Third International Congress of Phonetic Sciences, Held at the University of Ghent 18—22 July 1938.
 Edited by EDGARD BLANQUAERT and WILLEM PÉE. 535 pages.
 Ghent 1939.

The study of human speech, which is the object of the science of phonetics, involves the collaboration of disciplines otherwise wide apart. The investigation of the organs of speech and of the production of speech sounds pertains to physiology; the nature of these speech sounds is a problem of acoustics and thus studied by the physicist; the relation of the sounds to the speaker's consciousness pertains to psychology; while the linguist studies more especially the function of the sounds and pitch patterns, speech is to him chiefly a means of human communication. Then there is the anthropologist, who studies the speech of the different races, and the musician, who is interested in the relation between music and intonation. And finally there is the technician, who devises the apparatus used in experimental phonetics. Thus it was a gathering of scholars with widely differing interests that was held at Ghent, in July 1938, for the Third International Congress of Phonetic Sciences, whose Proceedings have now been published. The volume contains 72 short papers, many of which are illustrated with photographs and diagrams. A great variety of problems are touched, and the book is an interesting cross-section of present-day phonetics and of speech problems in general.

Since, a number of years ago, the terms "phonology" and "phoneme" were introduced into linguistics and have proved excellent stimuli to a development and extension of the science of phonetics, the relation between phonology and phonetics proper, the establishment of their respective domains, has become an ever recurring topic of discussion. These discussions are an echo of those held in the domain of general linguistics on the subject of F. de Saussure's distinction between "langue" and "parole", "la langue" being the domain of the phonologist, "la parole" that of the phonetician. The phonological papers of this congress touch chiefly upon questions of method and of terminology, without throwing new light on well known phenomena or proposing new problems.

Experimental Phonetics takes up another section. We learn that great progress is still being made in the exact recording of speech by means of electro-physical apparatus. One centre of such experimental work is Berlin, and Prof. Trendelenburg of Berlin-Siemensstadt relates the latest results of these researches (p. 128). The chief progress of his apparatus is that the long arithmetical hackwork, which, up to now, was unavoidable, has been replaced by a mechanical process.¹

A second centre is the Catholic University of Milan, where Agostino Gemelli has for a number of years been occupied with the electro-acoustic analysis of speech. But while the Berlin physicists are only physicists, i.e. provide the material for the psychologists and linguists to interpret, Gemelli has undertaken both these tasks. In his paper he first describes the apparatus he has constructed and the oscillographic results of his experiments, and then he proceeds to sketch the outlines of his psychological interpretation, an interpretation based chiefly on K. Bühler's "Sprachtheorie". Thus Gemelli to a large extent escapes the reproach cast by the linguists (e.g. Zwirner p. 57) upon the experimental phoneticians, that, by confining themselves to the study of the concrete acoustic phenomena, they completely neglect the psychological aspect, the impression a sound makes, not on an oscillograph, but on the consciousness of the hearer. It seems to us, however, that even Gemelli overstresses the importance, for the psychologist, of "figures and diagrams". Certainly the human ear is inadequate, mathematically speaking; but for the "Sprachpsychologe" this inadequacy is not quite so deplorable as Gemelli would have us believe.

In the section for Anthropology the problem of tone-languages is repeatedly touched upon. Dr. Ida Ward of London (p. 383) tells of semantic and grammatical tone in some West-African languages. Prof. Burssens of Ghent (p. 503) gives a demonstration of the use of a drum-signal in Luba, a tone language of the Belgian Congo. Another feature of some non-European languages is the click, a name given to inspiratory plosives (Schnalzlaute). The click is a normal feature in the languages of the Bushmen and Hottentots of Africa; but it was probably much more widespread in the remote past. Prof. van Ginneken, of Nijmegen, (p. 321) finds it in the old languages of the Caucasus, and he even ventures to launch the bold theory that the origin of all human speech is the click; this click, he says, then evolved into a group of inspiratory consonants, some of which became syllabic and formed the first vowels.

A musical expert (Heinitz p. 51) takes up the problem of a possible harmony between articulation and the melodic elements. According to him a certain group of sounds can be intoned and stressed harmoniously only in one way, because the sum total of speech energy is a constant in homogeneous speech. If the articulation requires more energy the melodic

¹ The electro-acoustic analysis of the intonation of English gramophone records, which was made according to the method of Dr. Ketterer in the English department of the University of Berlin, involved very much arithmetical work.

elements require less, and vice versa. If we know the sounds of a language we can, in theory, establish also the melodic patterns by means of the homogeneity test, which the author does not, however, describe. It is impossible, therefore, to form a judgment on this highly problematic theory, which recalls the tests of Sievers.

One section is devoted to the phonetic aspect of Broadcasting. We hear that in Great Britain and in the Dominions the question of the announcers' language is an important problem, and that no accent is tolerated; while in France¹ there are no restrictions whatever.

A number of papers on the phonetics of particular languages follow. Dutch occupies the first place. Dr. L. Kaiser of Amsterdam (p. 455) and her collaborators speak of their detailed analysis of the speech of a hundred students and of three hundred peasants. The aim of this analysis was twofold: Firstly, the difference between educated and uneducated speech was worked out; secondly, these speakers were at the same time analysed somatically and mentally (Kretschmer's method) and correlations between their individual speech habits and their somatic and mental peculiarities were established. English occupies a much smaller part. There is a paper on some sub-standard American vowels (Wise p. 42); one on dialect studies and sound change, with examples from the Linguistic Atlas of the U.S.A. and Canada (Penzl p. 251); D. Fry of London tells of sensitive gas flames, which are a means to correct speech defects, such as the substitution of θ for s. Then we hear of a tonic flexion in Portuguese (de Lacerda p. 396), which is extremely difficult for foreigners to acquire: a word pronounced without context of situation, as when read from a dictionary, or as answer to the question "What is the Portuguese for ...?", has an intonation and clang colour (Klangfarbe) that differs from the tone of the same word when it is a sentence word, a statement, e.g. as answer to the question: "What did you buy yesterday?". There is a paper on the quantity of sounds in Estonian (Ariste p. 276). In this Finno-Ugrian language at least three degrees of length are used diacritically.

The papers on the Physiology and Pathology of speech are on the borderline of phonetics and medicine, or already beyond it, as those on the paralysis of the palate, or on stammering.

The volume concludes with the draft of a paper which was to have been read by Prof. Prince Trubetzkoy, the Vienna phonologist, who died shortly before the congress.

Basel.

MARIA SCHUBIGER.

¹ Or in Holland, for that matter. — Ed

Brief Mention

English Scholars. By D. C. DOUGLAS. 381 pp. London: Jonathan Cape. 1939. Price 15 s.

This book by the Professor of History in the University of Leeds describes the lives and achievements of a number of English scholars who between 1660 and 1730 devoted themselves to the study of Old English and medieval history. The investigation and editing of old charters and records demanding and stimulating the study of the language in which they were written, this account of the labours of late seventeenth and early eighteenth century medievalists contains a great deal that is interesting to the philologist as well as to the historian. No student of Old English who cares for the history of his subject can fail to be attracted by the sections on Hickes, Thwaites, Wanley, Elizabeth Elstob and other 'Saxonists' (as regards the latter of whom there might have been a reference, on p. 86, n. 2, to Miss Ashdown's article in the MLR XX, 2, April 1925). "After Hickes's *Thesaurus*, Anglo-Saxon studies were to make no appreciable advance until the development of the new philology in the nineteenth century." The last three quarters of the eighteenth, the age of enlightenment and self-complacency, had only a superior smile, if not a sneer, for the intellectual giants of the earlier period.

The printing of the book shows some traces of having lacked the author's final revision, so that here and there a word or a sentence has gone wrong, while the form in which titles of German publications are given (e.g., Wülker: *Grundriss sur Geschichte* etc.) is beneath the dignity of scholarship. Even the Latin quotations are not always above suspicion. — R. W. Z.

Neuengland in der erzählenden Literatur Amerikas. Von HELENE WIDENMANN. (Studien zur englischen Philologie. Herausgegeben von Lorenz Morsbach und Hans Hecht. LXXXVI.) xiv and 128 pp. 8°. Halle (Saale): Max Niemeyer. 1935.

This is a rather vague, superficial and often inaccurate discussion of New England as a subject for long and short stories during the 19th century, principally those of the women of the so-called Local Color School from the early Sixties to the late Eighties. After a historical introduction based chiefly on Truslow Adams and a literary introduction after Coit Tyler, we get a first Hauptteil on how New England appeared to various writers from Catherine Maria Sedgwick early in the century down to the writers of the last generation, and a second Hauptteil which places the elements of New England life as they appear in the books discussed in a synthetic picture of the country from the farm-houses and churches all the way down to the Negroes and vagrant Indians that pass through them, including sections on New England customs and Neuenglische Weltanschauung. Most of what the author has to say is not new, but her last Hauptteil will serve as a welcome introduction to some of the main aspects of New England life for Continental readers not familiar with the stories or the reality. Complete, even from the point of view of a dissertation, the picture is very far from being and both the sociological backgrounds and the recent developments as well as recent literature have been only imperfectly drawn upon. O'Neill's *Desire under the Elms* is mentioned, but *Mourning Becomes Electra*, which is placed in New England because its atmosphere best fitted the theme, is forgotten. Frost is thrown into a basket along with Robinson and Emily Dickinson, but neither his own poetry nor that of Emily is made use of, though both throw an intense light on the subject here discussed. Miss Sedgwick, a most prolific New England writer and in her way the originator of the whole school of New England epic, is represented with only one story and that is obviously misdated. For

if *Hope Leslie* appeared in 1811 it antedates Cooper by more than 10 years and began the historical novel in America before Scott began it in Europe. The author herself uses a London edition of 1830 and the book should probably be dated 1827. Miss Sedgwick's first story was *A New England Tale* in 1822. — H. L.

Since Yesterday. The Nineteen-Thirties in America. By F. L. ALLEN. xiv + 362 pp. New York and London: Harper & Brothers. 1940. Price \$ 3.00.

Nearly seven years ago (*E.S.* XVI, 1934, p. 43) we announced and recommended *Only Yesterday: An Informal History of the Nineteen Twenties*, by the same author. Since then America has loomed ever larger in the course of world history, and is now well on its way to becoming the principal English-speaking country, from a political as well as a cultural point of view. More than ever, therefore, it behoves us to familiarize ourselves, as far as may be, with the life and thought of this gigantic nation, with its strength as well as its many weaknesses. Mr. Allen's survey of the nineteen thirties forms an excellent introduction to the subject; he knows how to select from the vast welter of facts that which is significant, and to make his chronicle of events comprehensive without becoming confusing. For the reader of contemporary American fiction, *Since Yesterday* provides the social and economic background to much of the literature current on this side of the Atlantic. The student of language finds in it the required context for a great deal of modern American idiom, intimately bound up as it necessarily is with the situations which gave it birth. For Mr. Allen is a keen observer, not only of social phenomena in general, but also of the phenomena of language, and his account of the rise of such a neologism as *boondoggling* — with reference to relief projects of questionable value — could not be bettered by a professional linguist (though he has taken it for granted that his readers would know what the *G* in *G-men* stands for). The illustrations are aptly chosen; one only wishes there were more of them. There is an Appendix with valuable suggestions for further reading. — Z.

Bibliography

PERIODICALS

Anglia. LXI, 1/2. Jan. 1937. H. M. Flasdieck, Das Verbum *wollen* im Altgermanischen (unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des Altenglischen). — H. M. Flasdieck, Ae. *dōn* und *zān*. — B. von Lindheim, Sprachliche Studien zu Texten des Ms. Cotton Galba E IX. — W. Matthews, Sailors' pronunciation, 1770-1783. — H. Penzl, Der [r]-Einschub nach me. *ā* in New-England. — E. Westergaard, Gaelic influence on Lowland Scottish. — W. Schmidt, Satz Sinn und Tonfall (Modus der betonten Tatsächlichkeit und intensive Aktionsart im Ne.). — E. E. Ericson, Noun clauses in *because*. — K. Malone, *Mid Moidum ic wæs*. — L. Forster, Die Assoziation in *Deors Klage*. — H. Henel, Ein Bruchstück aus Byrhtferps *Handbuch*. — B. J. Whiting, Reynard climbs (*Owl* 816). — F. P. Magoun, Kleine Beiträge zu *Sir Gawain*. — J. Ruska, Chaucer und das Buch Senior. — K. Brunner, Kirchenlieder aus dem 15. Jahrhundert. — F. Brie, Französischer Frühhumanismus in England. — H. Kenny, Shakespeare's Cressida. — P. Fijn van Draat, *King Lear*. — T. B. Stroup, Supernatural beings in Restoration drama. — W. Schmidt, Die Volksballaden von Tom dem Reimer. — W. Schmidt, Der Anlass zum Streit in der *Edward*

Ballade. — **Id.** LXI, 3/4. Juni 1937. H. M. Flasdieck, Harlekin. Germanischer Mythos in romanischer Wandlung. — M. Förster, *Ae. hrider, hridder und hriddel* im Lichte altbritischer Entlehnungen. — W. Krogmann, Altenglisches. — A. H. Krappe, The Offa-Constance legend. — G. K. Smart, English non-dramatic blank verse in the sixteenth century. — E. M. Simpson, The Folio text of Ben Jonson's *Sejanus*. — M. Korn, Sir Walter Scott und die Geschichte. — K. W. Maurer, The poetry of Emily Brontë. — **Id.** LXII, 1/4. Mai 1938. [Festschrift für L. L. Schücking.] B. von Münchhausen, Mein Jugend- und Altersfreund Levin Ludwig. — S. B. Liljegren, Zur Theorie über die Entstehung der sogenannten Lallwörter. — H. Schöffler, Zur Kultursoziologie des englischen ablautenden Verbuns. — W. Keller, Zur Chronologie der ae. Runen. — M. Förster, Die heilige Sativola oder Sidwell. — E. Eckhardt, Die Konsonantische Dissimilation im Englischen. — H. Koziol, Zur Syntax der englischen Urkundensprache des 14. und 15. Jahrhunderts. — O. Funke, William Bullokar's *Bref Grammar for English* (1586). — H. Huscher, Die englische Naturdichtung im Lichte der vergleichenden Literaturbetrachtung und der jüngsten Kritik. — E. von Schaubert, Zur Gestaltung und Erklärung des Beowulf-textes. — F. Holthausen, Eine neue lateinische Fassung der Andreaslegende. — H. M. Flasdieck, Das Kasseler Bruchstück der *Cura Pastoralis*. — E. Schröder, Einiges vom Buchtitel in der englischen Literatur des Mittelalters. — K. Brunner, Bisher unbekannte Schlusstrophen des *Court of Sapience*. — R. Kapp, Thomas Deloney, *The Gentle Craft*. — W. Schmidt, Sinnesänderung und Bildvertiefung in Shakespeares Sonetten. — M. Deutschbein, Die Tragik in Shakespeare *Julius Caesar*. — H. Heuer, Shakespeare und Plutarch. — W. Franz, Zur Sprachkunst Shakespeares. — W. Staerk, Stoffgeschichtliches. — L. Forster, Die Festlichkeiten bei der Trauung Friedrichs von der Pfalz 1612-1613. — K. Hammerle, *To save appearances* (Par. L. VIII 82), ein Problem der Scholastik. — H. Jensen, Die menschliche und dichterische Entwicklung Alexander Popes. — H. Lüdeke, Stephen Cranes Gedichte. — L. von Hübner, Der Rail-Road-Trust in der neueren politischen Romanliteratur Amerikas. — W. Fischer, *Der Letzte Puritaner*. — **Id.** LXIII, 1/2. Jan. 1939. W. Ebisch und L. L. Schücking, Bibliographie zur Geschichte des literarischen Geschmacks in England. — K. Malone, Lingfield again. — W. Krogmann, Altenglisches. — N. E. Eliason, The short vowels in French loan words like city, etc. — H. M. Flasdieck, Nachtrag zu *Anglia* 62, S. 193 ff. — H. Penzl, „Kompromissvokal“ und Lautwandel. — E. E. Ericson, Observations on New English syntax. — K. Malone, Notes on *Beowulf* IX-XI. — K. Hugenir, Further notes on the date of *The Owl and the Nightingale*. — P. Fijn van Draat, If Cordelia. — F. Brie, Popes *Brutus*. — N. Bøgholm, *The Ancient Mariner*. — K. W. Maurer, A. E. Housman. — **Id.** LXIII, 3/4. Aug. 1939. H. O. Wilde, Aufforderung, Wunsch und Möglichkeit. — E. Ekwall, The place-name *Lingfield*. — W. Krogmann, Altenglisches. — Fr. Kläber, *Beowulfiana minora*. — H. C. Matthes, Francis Meres und Erasmus von Rotterdam. — W. Fischer, Ein unbekannter Brief David Garricks an Samuel Richardson.

Beiblatt zur Anglia.¹ 46, 6. Juni 1935. W. Fischer reviews Jespersen, *Growth and Structure of the English Language*, 8th ed. — **Id.** 46, 10. Okt. 1935. O. S. Anderson rev. Bäck, *The Synonyms for "Child", "Boy", "Girl" in Old English*. — **Id.** 46, 12. Dec. 1935. W. Fischer rev. Schrijnen, *Essai de bibliographie de géographie linguistique générale*. — **Id.** 47, 3. März 1936. F. Holthausen rev. various studies on English place-names by Zachrisson. — H. Heuer rev. Snitslaar, *Sidelights on Robert Browning's "The Ring and the Book"*. — **Id.** 47, 5/6. Mai/Juni 1936. H. Mutschmann rev. Schubiger, *The Role of Intonation in Spoken English*. — **Id.** 47, 7. Juli 1936. F. Holthausen rev. Bense, *A Dictionary of the Low-Dutch Element in the English Vocabulary*, Part. IV. — K. Malone, The Inflexion of OE *gar* 'spear'. — H. Heuer rev. Schut & Zandvoort, *Engelse Spraakkunst voor Gymnasia*. — **Id.** 47, 8. Aug. 1936. E. Kruisinga, Zur Worstellung im Englischen.

¹ We can only index reviews of books by Dutch, Swiss and Scandinavian authors.

— Id. 47, 11. Nov. 1936. W. Fischer rev. Ekwall, *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of English Place-Names*. — F. Holthausen rev. Ekwall, *Studies in English Place-Names*. — J. Dietrich rev. Saxe, *Bernard Shaw's Phonetics*. — Id. 48, 1. Jan. 1937. W. Fischer rev. Zandvoort, *De Taak der Nederlandse Anglistiek*. — W. Preussler rev. Fransson, *Middle English Surnames of Occupation 1000-1350*. — W. Preussler rev. Kruisinga, *An Introduction to the Study of English Sounds*, 6th ed. — Id. 48, 2. Feb. 1937. H. Heuer rev. Reichling, *Het Woord*. — E. Kruisinga, Die Fürwörter *who, what* und *which* in Fragesätzen. — Id. 48, 3. März 1937. E. Kruisinga, Die persönlichen Fürwörter auf *-self*. — Id. 48, 5. Mai 1937. O. Jiriczek, Brumo in Macpherson's *Ossian*. — Id. 48, 7. Juli 1937. K. Brunner rev. Thorson, *Anglo-Norse Studies*. — L. v. Hibler rev. Hofstrand, *The Sege of Troye*. — K. Malone, Old English *Cære, Cäser, Cásere*. — Id. 48, 9. Sept. 1937. W. Héraucourt rev. Ohlander, *Studies on Coordinate Expressions in Middle English*. — K. Arns rev. Straumann, *Newspaper Headlines*. — Id. 48, 10. Okt. 1937. H. Koziol, Der Abfall des nachtonigen *-e* im Mittelhochdeutschen. — Id. 48, 11. Nov. 1937. W. Preussler rev. Jespersen, *Analytic Syntax*. — W. Kalthoff rev. Stamm, *Der aufgeklärte Puritanismus Daniel Defoes*. — H. Huscher rev. Bagdasarian, *William Blake*. — F. Holthausen, *Kiarr* und *Caesar*. — K. Malone, A metrical note on *Widsith*. — Id. 48, 12. Dez. 1937. K. Jost rev. Dahl, *Form and Function*. — W. Héraucourt rev. Bühler, Die „erlebte“ Rede im englischen Roman. — Id. 49, 1. Jan. 1938. W. Preussler rev. Mulder, *Cognition and Volition in Language*. — F. Holthausen, Zum Havelok. — Id. 49, 2. Feb. 1938. D. M. Mennie, A MS variant of Sir Walter Scott's *Battle of Sempach*. — Id. 49, 3. März 1938. W. Fischer rev. Zandvoort, *De Studie der Engelse Plaatsnamen*. — H. Koziol rev. Wijk, *The Orthography and Pronunciation of Henry Machyn*. — E. Kruisinga, „Each Other“ und „One Another“. — Id. 49, 5/6. Mai/Juni 1938. F. Holthausen rev. Von Feilitzen, *The Pre-conquest Personal Names of Domesday Book*. — D. Saurat rev. Liljegren, *The English sources of Goethe's Gretchen Tragedy*. — R. Metz rev. Frauchiger, *Der englische Modernismus in seinen neuzeitlichen Auswirkungen*. — H. M. Flasdieck, Zur Lautgeschichte von *me. i* im Frühne. — M. A. Korn, Sir Walter Scott's *Journal*. — Id. 49, 7. Juli 1938. W. Fischer und H. Lüdeke, Bernhard Fehr †. — E. Kruisinga, Die Wortfolge in den Englischen Substantivgruppen. — Id. 49, 10. Okt. 1938. L. L. Schücking rev. Anderson, *The Seafarer*. — Id. 49, 11. Nov. 1938. B. v. Lindheim rev. Funke, *Grammatica Anglicana* von P. Gr. (1594). — Id. 49, 12. Dez. 1938. F. Holthausen rev. Tengvik, *Old English Bynames*. — K. Malone, A Note on *Widsith* 9a. — S. B. Liljegren, *Miltons Italienische Reise*. — Id. 50, 2. Feb. 1939. B. v. Lindheim rev. Weman, *Old English Semantic Analysis and Theory*. — H. W. Häusermann, Das Ende einer europäischen Zeitschrift: „The Criterion“. — Id. 50, 3. März 1939. J. Ellinger rev. Lindelöf, *English Verb-Adverb Groups Converted into Nouns*. — Id. 50, 5. Mai 1939. A. Müller rev. Funke, *Englische Sprachphilosophie im späteren 18. Jahrhundert*. — Id. 50, 6. Juni 1939. W. Héraucourt rev. Reuter, *A Study of the French Words in the "Earliest Complete English Prose Psalter"*. — P. Meissner rev. Häusermann, *Studien zur englischen Literaturkritik 1910-1930*. — Id. 50, 9. Sept. 1939. H. Mutschmann, Die Beweggründe zu Miltons Festlandreise. — Id. 50, 10. Okt. 1939. F. Holthausen, Zum *me. Hymnus* auf Maria und Christus. — Id. 50, 11. Nov. 1939. F. Klæber, A few *Beowulf* jottings. — Id. 50, 12. Dez. 1939. F. Holthausen rev. Anderson, *The English Hundred-Names. The South-Western Counties*. — W. Kalthoff rev. Braaksma, *Travel and Literature*.

Englische Studien. 70, 1. April 1935. [Festschrift für K. Luick.] F. Wild, Karl Luick. — H. Schöffler, Dank an Luick. — V. Mathesius, Zur synchronischen Analyse fremden Sprachguts. — A. S. C. Ross, Notes on the Runic Stones at Holy Island. — W. Krogmann, Altenglisch *āntid* und seine Sippe. — W. Horn, Altenglisch *hwæpere* 'dennoch'. — M. Förster, Altenglisch *stōr*, ein altrisches Lehnwort. — E. Ekwall, Some notes on English place-names containing names of heathen deities. — R. E. Zachrisson, English place-name compounds containing descriptive nouns in the

genitive. — K. Malone, Healfdene. — J. Hoops, Beowulf 457 f.: *For werefyhtum and for ārstafum*. — R. Hittmair, Zu den Aktionsarten im Mittenglischen. — A. Pirkhofer, Zum syntaktischen Gebrauch des bestimmten Artikels bei Caxton. — A. Eichler, Zu Chaucer, *Canterbury Tales*, General Prologue, L. 207. — K. Brunner, Mittelenglische Marienstunden. — H. Ch. Matthes, Zur Textkritik der Stockholmer Medicinhandschrift X 90. — O. Jespersen, A few back-formations. — A. E. H. Swaen, Malapropism. — W. Franz, Klangwirkung und Wortstellung. — M. Deutschbein, Der rhythmische Charakter der neuenglischen Bibelübersetzung von 1611. — H. C. Wyld, The significance of *-n* and *-en* in Milton's spelling. — A. Gabrielson, Elisha Coles's "Syncrisis" (1675) as a source of information on 17th century English. — H. Koziol, Bemerkungen zum Gebrauch einiger neuenglischen Zeitformen. — B. Fehr, Erlebte Kausalität. Ein Problem der Stilkunde. — A. Trampe Bödtker, Arthur Brooke and his Poem. — A. Brandl, Zur Quelle des *Macbeth*. — O. L. Jiriczek, Zur Bibliographie und Textgeschichte von Hugh Blair's *Critical Dissertation on the Poems of Ossian*. — A. Closs, Zur Frage des Romantischen in Byron's *Childe Harold's Pilgrimage*. — E. Eckhardt, Lord Byrons komische Reime. — A. Schröer, Anglistik und deutsches Volksinteresse. Ein geschichtlicher Rückblick. — Id. 70, 2. Aug. 1935. K. Brunner, Zwei Gedichte aus der Handschrift Trinity College, Cambridge 323 (B. 14. 39). — G. M. Turnell, Dryden and the religious elements in the classical tradition. — Id. 70, 3. März 1936. Fr. Klaeber, Drei Anmerkungen zur Texterklärung. — B. J. Whiting, "Old maids lead apes in hell". — P. Fijn van Draat, King Lear and his daughters. — H. Drennon, Newtonianism in James Thomson's poetry. — A. Ehrentreich, Neue Variationen zum Tristanthema. — J. Hoops, P. Fijn van Draat. — Id. 71, 1. Aug. 1936. A. E. H. Swaen, An essay in blue. — M. Frein von Appel, Zur Schreibung der interdentalen Spirans im Mittenglischen. — F. Brie, Thomas More der Heitere. — J. Schütze, Daniels "Cleopatra" und Shakespeare. — J. Ellinger, Die Konjunktionale Verwendung von substantivischen Wortgruppen mit oder ohne *that* im neueren Englisch. — Id. 71, 2. Dez. 1936. E. von Erhardt-Siebold, The hellebore in Anglo-Saxon pharmacy. — M. J. Wolff, Die soziale Stellung der englischen Renaissancedramatiker. — F. T. Wood, Christopher Smart. — Koziol, Wertungsbedingte Lautwandlungen im Neuenglischen. — C. A. Bodelsen, The expanded tenses in Modern English. An attempt at an explanation. — P. Lange, *Practically*. Eine Lücke in den englisch-deutschen Wörterbüchern. — Id. 71, 3. Juni 1937. H. M. Fladieck, Das algermanische Verbum Substantivum unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des Altenglischen. — F. Th. Bowers, Henry Howard Earl of Northampton and Duelling in England. — A. T. Shillinglaw, New light on Ben Jonson's Discoveries. — S. O. Parsons, Carlyle's gropings about Montrose. — F. van Briesen, Lafcadio Hearn: Dekadent? Aesthet? Exotist? — H. Koziol, Zum Gebrauch der englischen Tempora. — A. C. Dunstan rev. Schubiger, *The Role of Intonation in Spoken English*. — M. Rösler rev. Straumann, *Newspaper Headlines*. — Id. 72, 1. Okt. 1937. F. P. Magoun, Jr., Strophische Überreste in den altenglischen Zaubersprüchen. — H. B. Woolf, The name of Beowulf. — M. Förster, König Eadgars Tod († 975). — M. Priesz, Das Hamlet-Problem. — J. Ellinger, Die Gerundalfügung mit und ohne Präposition im neueren Englisch. — R. Stamm, Paul Elmer Mores Suche nach einer lebendigen Tradition. — R. Hoops, Die Weltanschauung Aldous Huxleys. — P. Meissner rev. Stamm, *Der aufgeklärte Puritanismus Daniel Deföes*. — H. Richter rev. Bagdasarianz, *William Blake*. — Id. 72, 2. April 1938. E. Eckhardt, Reim und Stabreim im Dienste der neuenglischen Wortbildung. — M. Lehnert, Die Abhängigkeit frühneuenglischer Grammatiken. — J. W. Draper, "Macbeth" as a compliment to James I. — J. E. Wells, Thomson's "Seasons", 1744 — an unnoticed edition. — H. Heuer, Browning und Donne. (Hintergründe einer Wortentlehnung.) — S. von Ullmann, Synästhesien in den dichterischen Werken von Oscar Wilde. — R. E. Zachrisson rev. Ekwall, *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of English Place-Names*.